

**CANON HENSON AT THE LONDON WESLEYAN MINISTERS' MEETING.**

The interest excited in Canon Henson's address to the London Wesleyan Ministers' Meeting was shown by the presence of half-a-dozen representatives of the London and provincial dioceses at Wesley's Chapel, City-road, on Monday afternoon. Naturally, their request for permission to report the proceedings was refused, for this gathering is entirely a ministerial one, at which questions of doctrine are freely discussed in a manner impossible in a public assembly. The attendance of ministers was very large when Rev. Walford Green took the chair and introduced the speaker. There was considerable surprise among those unfamiliar with the Canon's personality, at his slight, almost boyish figure; but his address was followed with close attention, and many passages were received with signs of hearty approval.

**CONQUEST AND CONCILIATION.**

Canon Henson began with a very vigorous depreciation of the modern theory that spiritual efficiency is served by denominational competition, characterising the policy of unchecked individualism as next door to the commercial attitude. Christian unity might be obtained by two methods—conquest and conciliation. The former had behind it a large tradition of Christian acceptance; the policy of the modern theory honestly and recklessly applied through long periods, with the result that Europe had been deluged with blood, and the unity of Christendom had been indefinitely postponed by the traditions of bitterness and suspicion left behind by these futile barbarities.

Every church which claimed to represent exclusively the intention and institution of Jesus Christ was committed to the principles of religious conquest. From the bitter fountain of exclusive theory the sweet waters of Christian tolerance could never flow. Having thus cleared the ground, the Canon proceeded to enunciate his own theory of conciliation. The cause of Christian unity could best be served by affirming the elementary truth that discipleship involved fellowship in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that the refusal of that fellowship implied the denial of the character of discipleship. By discipleship the Canon explained that he meant the state of life and heart which satisfied the conditions prescribed by Jesus Himself, and which presented to public view the marks He authorised. This principle, the speaker claimed, was actually implied in the language of "that very noteworthy, important, and valuable composition," the Evangelical Free Church Catechism, and he quoted the answers to Questions 33, 34, and 35 in the Catechism, to substantiate his claim. He believed that while they ought to recognise the plain testimony of experience, and tolerate, as not necessarily or finally destructive of the Unity of Christ's body, the multiplicity of divinely organised Churches, they ought not to surrender the ideal of the

One Visible Church, visibly united by a common organisation.

**ISOLATION OF ANGLICAN CHURCH.**

Turning to the practical aspect, the Canon urged that the problem should be approached from the side of the Christian society, not from that of the Christian ministry. Speaking from the standpoint of the Anglican Churchman, he asserted that the isolation of his Church from the rest of Christendom was a lamentable blunder, unless it could be proved to be a necessity. Anglicans were admittedly restless under that isolation, as was shown by the approaches made to the Oriental and Roman Churches; but he agreed with the Bishop of Exeter that it was more reasonable to make advances to Christians of their own blood and speech. The great obstacle in the way of such advances was the rigid doctrine of the Episcopacy. On the theory of Apostolic Succession Anglicans could have no other relations with the non-Episcopal Churches than those of hostility.

**INTERCOMMUNION.**

In a parenthesis Canon Henson explained his individual attitude on the question of conceding the right of Anglicans to communicate with non-Episcopalians, of preaching in non-Episcopal pulpits, and personally joining in the celebration of Holy Communion in non-Episcopal Churches. If the decision of the issue at stake were in his hands, he would gladly do all these things, but as an official of a Church, solemnly pledged to obey its discipline, he could be no party to such procedure, though he would assert himself steadily to secure, by constitutional modes, the abrogation of all in the Anglican system which prohibited intercommunion. This frank statement was received with much sympathy by his audience. Returning to the main question, the Canon claimed that the Church of England had two distinct advantages for playing the rôle of arbitrator and peacemaker among the organised committees of English-speaking Christians, viz., its historic position as the Mother Church, and its preservation of the tradition of the older Catholic system in the matter of creeds, the liturgy, the fundamental character of the Christian ministry as a divinely commissioned pastorate of souls, and the intimate contact with all aspects of the national life. Finally, the Canon declared that the articles agreed upon at the Lambeth Conference of 1838 went far to provide a basis on which intercommunion between the Church of England and the most considerable non-Episcopal Churches might be negotiated. He found that these articles were substantially contained in the teaching of the Evangelical Free Church Catechism, though neither the Apostles' nor the Nicene Creed was named; still, their doctrine and their language were certainly expounded therein. The reception of members of non-Episcopal Churches to communion in the Anglican Church would imply the recognition of the validity of non-Episcopal ministers, and therefore fulfil the first condition of a restoration of unity. Further, this policy of essential essentiality of Christendom, and early worshipping apart, for the common reception of the Sacrament of unity, would

mitigate the lingering soreness of old separations and predispose all towards that godly union and concord so long vainly sighed for.

**APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.**

In a happy response, Rev. F. W. Macdonald dwelt upon the strategic position of the whole subject, the question of Apostolic Succession. He believed the Anglican Church had never formally committed herself to that theory since the Reformation, but it was practically the paramount doctrine. Was it at all likely that this doctrine would lose its hold on the Anglican Church? He believed that three considerations would slowly and unconsciously undermine its position. These were the study of the New Testament in the modern spirit and method of Lightfoot and Westcott; historical study on the lines of the Hatch research; the widening of the area of the life of the British people caused by the intercommunion between members of the English race in both hemispheres. He could not predict any speedy change of sentiment on this crucial question in the Anglican Church, because it did not rest on any definite premises which logical argument and proof could overthrow. Rev. Dr. Agar Beet seconded a vote of thanks to Canon Henson, and the meeting closed with the Benediction.

**NEWS OF THE CHURCHES.**

**Congregational.**

— Dr. A. Guinness Rogers, of Washington, has accepted the pastorate of South Cliff Church, Scarborough. He will not, it is understood, commence his duties till April, in the meantime returning to America.

— The Rev. C. F. Bryer, of Hitchin, has been elected secretary of the central district of the Hertfordshire Union, in succession to the Rev. D. B. Hooks, who has retired after nine years' service.

— The Rev. W. J. Jobling, of Rendham, who has been contemplating a change of pastorate during the past year, has decided to relinquish his charge at the end of this month.

— Mr. Edward J. Sainsbury, of Nottingham College, has accepted a very hearty and unanimous call to the pastorate of the church at Fakenham, Norfolk.

— Mr. Charles Gesson, of A.T.S., late of Chesham College, who has been supplying the pulpit at Norton-road Church, Stockton-on-Tees, for the past three months, has had a unanimous invitation to remain as pastor of the church.

— The Rev. Isaac Hartill, Free Church chaplain to Marylebone and St. George's Unions, W., who has supplied the pulpit at Orange-street Church, Leicester-square, London, for several months, has been unanimously invited to undertake the general oversight for the next six months, and has consented to do so.

— The Sheffield Association, which has been in existence for a quarter of a century, held its annual meeting last Thursday, under the chairmanship of Mr. E. Tuck. The hon. secretary, the Rev. J. Lewis Pearce, intimated that Dr. Horton, of London, had consented to preach the annual sermon on April 24th; that the Rev. B. Dale, M.A., would lead off the discussion on February 6th, on Dr. Parker's proposal for the federation of the Congregational

# Anglicans and Nonconformists

THE

# WEEKLY

Social and Christian Progress. 24 Pages

THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1902.

Subscription Terms:— [United Kingdom, 6s. 9d. per ann., 11s. 6d. abroad.] Price One Penny.

## Contents.

The New Spirit In the Church of England ..	590
Current Chat .. .. .	539
Latest News .. .. .	539
Business Notes. By J. E. H. W. ..	531
Notes of the Week: The Liberal League—Lord Rosebery and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman— Antonio's Letter—The Remount Scandal—The Disaster near Klerkadorp—Lord Kitchener's Striking Success .. .. .	531
Sunday Afternoon—Prayer .. .. .	532
The Secret of Endurance. Christian Endeavour Topic. By Rev. T. H. Darlow .. .. .	533
A Contidenco .. .. .	533
Celebrity. By W. Hale White .. .. .	533
Dr. Whyte's Classes .. .. .	532
"H.-B." By our Parliamentary Correspondent .. .. .	533
British Table Talk .. .. .	533
From our own Correspondents: Scotland, Ire- land, Wales .. .. .	533
The Banner of Blue. By S. R. Crockett. Chap- ter XXXVIII.—Little Johnny to the Rescue. Chapter XXXIX.—Fate Rides Before .. .. .	534
The Liberal Crisis .. .. .	535
Church of England Notes .. .. .	535
News from the Provinces .. .. .	536
Answers to Correspondents. By Rev. R. J. Cawthell, B.A. .. .. .	535
The Woman's World. By Lorna .. .. .	536
Literature: Women in Love.—Peter III., Emperor of Russia .. .. .	536
New Books Received .. .. .	536
The Crisis in the Liberal Party: Interview with Mr. R. W. Perks, M.P. By Lorna .. .. .	539
A Lady's Experience in the Concentration Camps .. .. .	539
The Correspondence of Claudius Clear: Does Secularity of Tenure Promote Efficiency? 541 Rambling Remarks. By A Man of Kent .. .. .	541
News of the Churches .. .. .	542-547
Births, Marriages, Deaths .. .. .	548
The Ladies' Column. By Winifred .. .. .	548
Answers to Correspondents .. .. .	548
International Sunday School Lesson .. .. .	550

The Editor cannot return manuscripts under any circumstances.

In THE BRITISH WEEKLY of Thursday, April 3, we shall publish the first instalment of an important new serial story, entitled "A Whaleman's Wife," by FRANK T. BULLEN.

## THE NEW SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.\*

CANON HENSON, in his introduction, says that some years ago he wrote to the *Guardian*, criticising a sermon of Archdeacon SINCLAIR, which advocated a recognition of the non-Episcopal Churches. Now he has come to think that he was wrong, and that Archdeacon SINCLAIR was right. Since then, Dr. SINCLAIR has explained that he was advocating not the recognition of non-Episcopal Churches as Churches, but the friendly treatment of their ministers. He was, in fact, dealing with the problem expressed in the words, Ought we to visit them? Dr. SINCLAIR apparently thinks that Nonconformity is always sitting on the edge of its chair in hopes of social recognition from the Church, and he is disposed to further its ambitions to that extent. On this subject we have nothing to say, save that there seems to be a certain awkwardness in discussing such questions within earshot of the supposed candidates for beatification.

\* "Godly Union and Concord." Sermons preached mainly in Westminster Abbey in the interest of Christian Fraternity. By H. Hensley Henson, D.D., Canon of Westminster. (John Murray.)

"Fifty Years at East Brent." Letters of Archdeacon Denison, with portrait and illustrations. (John Murray.)

The issue raised by Canon HENSON is, however, of quite another kind, and we gladly recognise that he has dealt with it in a thoroughly Christian spirit, and with considerable ability. He commands our respect from the first by his frank acknowledgment of a change in opinion. Once he protested against ecclesiastical recognition of Nonconformists, against their admission to communion. Now he finds himself unable to proceed on the old assumption. The mind that grows from narrowness to tolerance, and from tolerance to love, is surely guided by the Spirit of CHRIST. Canon HENSON'S position is well expressed in the following passage: "Not a conference or a congress of Churchmen meets without effusive welcome from Nonconformists. A few weeks ago I sat in the Congress Hall at Brighton, and listened to a series of speeches by prominent Nonconformists, all expressing the warmest sentiment of Christian fraternity. I reflected that, by the existing law and current practice of our Church, all those excellent orators and their fellow believers were spiritual outcasts; that if they presented themselves for the sacrament of unity they would be decisively rejected; that in no consecrated building might their voices be heard from the pulpit, though all men—as in the case of Dr. DALE of Birmingham—owned their conspicuous power and goodness. The contradiction came home to my conscience as an intolerable outrage, and I determined to say here to-day, in this famous pulpit to which your kindness has bid me, what I had long been thinking—that the time has come for Churchmen to remove barriers for which they can no longer plead political utility, and which have behind them no sanction in the best conscience and worthiest reason of our time." We desire to meet all such approaches cordially and respectfully. Nonconformists everywhere are grieved at the severance between themselves and fellow Christians whom they hold in the highest regard, and on whose work they invoke GOD'S richest blessing. Canon HENSON must already be aware of this. Nevertheless, we are bound to say that this matter of the recognition or non-recognition of Free Churchmen concerns the Church of England far more than it concerns us. Free Churchmen have no difficulty in recognising the Church of England as a part of the visible Church. It is not necessary to enlarge or to be effusive on this point. Those who refuse to recognise Christians as Christians incur the most serious responsibility. They ought to be absolutely certain of their ground. To refuse to recognise as a Church any organised body of believers is an act which can be justified only on the ground that a particular organisation has been laid down by the Master as essential to the existence of a Church. If there is any such essential form of organisation, it must be essential

to the existence of piety and the presence of the HOLY SPIRIT. Now the extremest partisans of exclusive Anglicanism will hesitate to deny the existence of piety, the reality of goodness, and the blessing of the HOLY GHOST in other denominations. Already the Anglican Church is but a fragment in the Christianity of English-speaking peoples. In the United States it is outnumbered over and over by other Protestant bodies. We doubt whether anyone would say that Anglicanism has nourished a higher type of piety and conduct than other bodies named by the name of CHRIST. Her works bear witness to her that she is of GOD, but certainly not in any special manner. These are facts that must impress themselves on all serious minds. It has to be remembered also that the New Testament enjoins, as a main duty of Christians and as a badge of discipleship, the love of the brethren. Hereby, said the Master, shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another. He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love GOD Whom he hath not seen? We know that we have passed from death into life because we love the brethren. There can be no Scriptural love of the brethren which does not recognise them as brethren. "It matters not by what name they may be called, whether they follow with us or not; if they bear the image of CHRIST, those who fail to recognise and honour them fail to love the brethren; they reject and despise those whom CHRIST has received, and have reason to consider seriously lest CHRIST should say to them, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not unto Me. It would avail us little in such a case to say we did not regard him as a brother, for that is the very heart of the offence. If a man is a brother, and gives the Scriptural evidence of the fact, not to see and recognise that evidence is an indication of that very state of mind which is so offensive to our Divine Master." To refuse to recognise as brethren those whom CHRIST has received as disciples is a direct violation of CHRIST'S command. No differences on Church government excuse such a refusal, any more than a difference in colour or in politics or in culture would justify it. Canon HENSON in various places shows that the weight of this consideration has pressed upon him heavily. It may well press on the exclusives of the Church of England. From a certain point of view Free Churchmen may naturally say that they are not craving for admission to the communion in the Church of England. Their life has been nourished in their own fellowships, by their own sacraments, and they are not afraid that the channels of grace will be dried up. Nevertheless, the more truly Christian the spirit of Nonconformists is, the more they will desire to realise the fellowship between them and other Christians,

the more they will rejoice in the obstacles to such fellowship being removed. They will rejoice especially because the existence of these obstacles does more than almost anything to retard the recognition of CHRIST by the world. It is when His disciples are one in heart that the world will believe that GOD has sent His Son.

On this subject the doctrine of Protestant Churches generally is clear, although we do not deny that now and then it has been temporarily misunderstood. Every body that professes the true religion is a Church of CHRIST, and to be recognised as such. By the profession of the true Church is meant the acknowledgment of fundamental faiths. Churches may fall into grave errors, but so long as they hold the faith that saves amidst whatever corruptions and negations, they are Christian Churches. What they believe, not what they disbelieve, is the essential point. We are bound to admit to the Table of the LORD all who believe in the LORD JESUS CHRIST. The Protestant Confessions declare that the Word and Sacraments are the criterion of a constituent portion of the visible Catholic Church. The Westminster Confession omits the Sacraments and makes the Word the sole criterion. The lowest terms of salvation are the highest admissible terms of communion. In Scotland, at various periods, those who seceded from the Church have required those who wish to commune with them to join in their peculiar testimony. They have refused to commune with any other than their own Churches. In the early days of the Free Church doctrines were taught on this head which were wholly indefensible. In this country a section of Baptists maintain close communion. This is the same deadly error. Christian communion is a communion of men as Christians, not as Baptists, or Presbyterians, or Methodists, or Episcopalians. We do not guarantee the complete orthodoxy of those whom we admit to communion. All we do is to recognise them as Christians. Another departure from the truth is the refusal of some Protestants to recognise the Church of Rome as a Church of CHRIST, to deny the validity of Romish baptism. But this is a monstrous transgression of the Christian law, for who will deny that true believers have been nourished in the Church of Rome? Who will deny that the Church of Rome retains the fundamental doctrines of Christianity? As Dr. CHARLES HODGE, the unrivalled exponent of reformed theology, has said: "We do not understand how it is possible for any Christian man to answer this question in the negative. They [Roman Catholics] retain the doctrine of the Incarnation, which we know from the infallible Word of GOD is a life-giving doctrine. They retain the whole doctrine of the Trinity. They teach the doctrine of the Atonement far more fully and accurately than multitudes of professedly orthodox Protestants. They hold a much higher doctrine as to the necessity of Divine influence than prevails among many whom we recognise as Christians. They believe in the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and in eternal life and judgment; and we must remember that it is truth presented in general propositions, and not with subtle distinctions, that saves the soul." We believe that amongst Free Churchmen there is all but unanimous agreement on these principles. We know no Presbyterian who would un-

know no Christian teacher who would deny that the Church of Rome is a branch of CHRIST'S visible Church. We have every reason to believe that the practice of close communion amongst Baptists is steadily decaying.

Canon HENSON has much to say on the ancient practice of the Church of England. On this subject Dr. GOODE'S "Rule of Faith" is not superseded, and the very competent work of Mr. ANDERSON SCOTT, "Evangelical Doctrine—Bible Truth," ought to be consulted. Canon HENSON'S conclusions are largely those of a generous and open-eyed Christian man. But in this matter criticism has done much, and will do more. The new spirit in the Church of England is strikingly brought out by Archdeacon DENISON'S angry references to Dr. GORE. The Archdeacon deserves the credit of saying that one who had conceded so much as Dr. GORE felt himself bound to stop where he did. The principles and arguments that compelled Dr. GORE to break with his old friends on the doctrine of inspiration would in time disintegrate his arguments for Anglican exclusiveness. Canon HENSON has been much influenced by recent criticism. His concessions, as it seems to us, are sometimes unwarranted. Still, the inevitable process goes on. Bishop GORE is to the Church of England very much what Dr. DÖLLINGER was to the Church of Rome. When in 1863 DÖLLINGER summoned the famous Congress at Munich, the position of the Roman Catholic Church had many analogies to the present position of the High Church section in Anglicanism. Then, as now, there was a conflict between those who thought mainly about the immediate interests of the Church, who allowed its interests to guide them in forming opinions and using knowledge, and between scientific students who pursued the quest of truth without trying to economise and manage it, believing that in the end honest investigation must contribute to the glory of GOD and the good of the Church. It is no wonder that Churchmen of the conservative school should be jealous of the principles and tenour of a scientific theology. The results of students were often unwelcome. They did not by any means augment the polemical resources of strict Roman Catholics. They put strange difficulties in the way of controversialists, they multiplied problems, they turned favourite arguments to irrelevancies, they compelled at least a lower and more moderate tone, and in some cases they enforced a large revision of opinion. We hardly know the Anglican theologian who now occupies Archdeacon DENISON'S position. His letters have a quaint interest. They are good specimens of sturdy controversy, but they are nothing more. The German theologians of the Roman Catholic Church forty years ago were full of intellectual activity. They contended that the opinions of Jesuits in Rome ought not to be made binding on the German Catholics. DÖLLINGER was at the time apparently unconscious of what he had done, and what he was about to do. He had published obnoxious writings on the temporal power of the Pope; he had given historical proof that the Pope could fall into heresy. In fact, he had a knack of turning untenable positions occupied by Catholics. He had shown that certain reasonings familiar in Roman Catholic schools were founded on illusion and fraud. Under his hand

ancient and tenacious traditions suffered transformation. He aimed at separating what was accidental and foreign in Roman Catholicism from what was permanent and essential. It seemed to him that theological science among Roman Catholics lay in its winter sleep. Nor did he want many to back him at the time. But the Church of Rome has powers which the Church of England can never have. The Church of Rome can put down criticism by acts of violence. It can make it subject to the Roman congregations. It can claim the power of infallibility. No doubt it loses in the process many of its adherents but those who remain repose in the judgment of the Church, and the more emphatic—we had almost said the less reasonable—the assertions of the Church are, the more implicitly they are received. Archdeacon DENISON and those who agreed with him would have preferred that way. But the path is closed for Anglicans. We know what the end of Dr. DÖLLINGER'S work in the Church of Rome was. Nobody believes that Bishop GORE and the rational High Churchmen can be excluded from their party. They go on amidst much suspicion and many protests, but they have the upper hand. For the present they maintain the exclusive claims of the Church of England. Canon HENSON'S desertion, however, is a notable event, and he will not be without his followers. We have never looked upon Bishop GORE as in the strict sense an original and disinterested student of theology. His business has rather been to adapt and explain the results of criticism to unprepared minds, to concede what had to be conceded and yet seek to retain that doctrine of the apostolic succession which is so dearly prized by many among his brethren. Will Bishop GORE succeed? Will he ever be able to resist by his arguments the whole drift of modern thought and learning? Canon HENSON very justly criticises Dr. MOBERLY—in our opinion one of the most sophistical writers who has ever handled great theological problems. He follows Mr. ANDERSON SCOTT in pointing out that the arguments of Bishop GORE are already crumbling under his feet. Thus Dr. GORE says: "There can be at least no doubt of the existence in Jerusalem of an Episcopal succession of immemorial antiquity." But Mr. C. H. TURNER has just investigated that list, and come to the conclusion that it is not authentic and that therefore "we cannot adduce the succession at Jerusalem as a continuous witness to primitive Episcopacy." Free Churchmen may well take heart. The tide runs steadily in their favour. Every scholar is, consciously or unconsciously, working upon their side. Already the stoutest of their opponents admit that the orders of Presbyterianism and Congregationalism may be valid.

The facts of the spiritual life are forcing themselves on the most reluctant eyes. The path to unity is hard and high, but the LORD'S prayer, *That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee*, will be answered at last. "I had not heard the LORD Himself, says St. AUGUSTINE, "I could not have believed that He could pass through the closed doors; it is marvellous, but my faith yields. That He should unite us with Himself—it is a miracle of love; but my credence still holds out; but when I heard these words, *That they all may be one*, I fall down and worship and cry out with tears, 'LORD, I believe help Thou mine unbelief.'"

and prominent business man, had had made a portable altar and a chancel rail which can be taken down, the corners being joined with hinges, and packed into a compass not exceeding eight feet long and from one-and-a-half to two feet wide: a unique and novel arrangement.

At the evening service Roman Catholics, Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians were present. In addition to the choir, who had carefully prepared themselves for the Easter music (for we were commemorating Easter although a week late in time), a brass band had volunteered to play a religious piece, provided that they would be permitted to retire immediately after rendering it, which was just before the sermon, as they had a standing engagement to play at the theatre. I regret to say that it was open on Sunday night; but their offer was accepted and the permission granted. The Rev. Mr. Earhart read the lessons, while Mr. Stocking assisted in the service. The former is the devoted, self-denying, broad-minded Presbyterian minister of Republic, who has been stationed there for the past three or four years and who, in order to administer more acceptably to the Churchmen of the community (who are more numerous than the Presbyterians), was, at his own request, some time ago confirmed by the Bishop—a veritably unique and unparalleled act in the annals of the Christian Church.

He has been struggling against great pecuniary and other odds for some time past, but I am glad to say that an arrangement has been recently entered into by which he is to receive a definite salary from the Presbyterian Church as its representative and missionary, a smaller stipend from ourselves, and a still larger sum from the citizens of Republic irrespective of their ecclesiastical affiliations.

One Sunday of each month, with the fifth Sunday of the month also whenever it occurs, has been courteously accorded to us by the presbytery. On such Sundays Mr. Earhart will read the service as lay reader by appointment of the Bishop.

It is the great desire of the Bishop, of Mr. Earhart, and the community generally at Republic that sectarianism shall be eliminated as much as possible from the locality. A majority of the church-going population, with a larger proportion of Churchmen, I believe, than of any other body, consider that under present conditions the presence of but one minister is needed to supply their spiritual needs. There is just now, however, a Baptist minister who preaches to a small congregation, as well as a Roman Catholic church in the town.

As members of a Church which has been more urgent than any other ecclesiastical body, Protestant or otherwise, as to the necessity of Christian unity, ought we not, while loyal to the Church and her teachings, to heartily welcome this genuine, if unique, step forward towards the realization of this great object? I certainly think so.

On my return trip to Spokane I was accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Earhart, and stopped off at Bossburg and Maroons. At Bossburg we were cheerfully given the use of the Congregational church, Mr. Earhart preaching the sermon, while I delivered two short addresses preceding and following the sermon.

At Maroons, a village of from two to three hundred inhabitants, we held a Sunday morning service at which Mr. Earhart preached. In the evening Mr. Earhart read the service and I preached the sermon; ninety persons being present. I also administered the Holy Communion to six individuals, one a Presbyterian, two or three Baptists, and the remaining two members of some other Christian body. So Christian unity is sometimes realized in act as well as in theory and on paper.

The place of worship was the town-hall, with little about it to remind one of a church edifice. It was in this building, two years ago, that I held an evening service and discovered six empty bottles standing in a row on a ledge between the studding, three of which were marked Pabst and the other three emblazoned with the name of Kentucky. On this occasion I found but two bottles, and in a less conspicuous position. Let us hope that the cause of temperance is improving at Maroons.

The town is now quite a railroad centre, as it is the starting point for the V. V. and E. Railroad into Republic now in process of building as a branch of the Great Northern. Prior to my visit no religious service of any kind had been held there for at least eight months. I am glad to say that arrangements have since been made for a regular week-day service in the future.

A twofold lesson was taught me by my trip. First, the crying need of at least one clergyman of the Church, in a region, roughly speaking, one hundred and thirty miles long and at least fifty miles wide, to administer to the sheep—so many of whom are without a shepherd—members of our own communion, who are very desirous to have regular services inaugurated, as well as more frequent celebrations of the Lord's Supper, instead of but one visit a year from either the Bishop or the general missionary, whose field of labor covers in extent an area equal to one and a third times the size of the State of Pennsylvania. There are also those who have no Church connections, but whose spiritual needs the Church and her ways are especially adapted to meet.

Secondly, the necessity for and the providential opening to initiate some plan of Church unity that shall foster the felt and growing need and desire, in this Western land at least, for a practical solution of the problem of Christian unity.

Secularism, for which we are all responsible, and materialism are the two most serious obstacles, as I believe, to the growth of true spirituality in the West.

Spokane.

WM. L. BULL.

## A Lesson in Church Unity.

*The Church Standard*

May 31/02.

BY THE GENERAL MISSIONARY OF THE DISTRICT OF SPOKANE.

ON Easter Even I left Spokane for Northport and Colville, where I held Easter services and celebrated the Holy Communion. I was courteously accorded the use of the Congregational church. A couple of days later I started for Republic, via Rosland and Grand Forks, in British Columbia. It was a most beautiful, wild, and picturesque ride as the train glided along the Columbia, Sheep and Kettle rivers, passing en route the beautiful falls known as the Bridal Veil, above Northport. Between Robson and Cascade at times the railroad seemed to be almost suspended in mid-air. It winds its way far above the river and Lake Christina, along precipitous mountain sides, crossing high and frail looking trestles, which remind one of gigantic cobwebs set on edge as they span the ravines and torrent beds. The mountain tops are covered with snow, adding greatly to the beauty of the scene. I am surprised that the praises of the wonderful scenery along this route have not been more frequently sung.

At Republic I baptized one infant, administered the Holy Communion, and held morning and evening service on the Sunday after Easter in a hall rented for the purpose. Mr. Stocking, an earnest Churchman

*Teaching of the Church of England  
on some points of Religion, set  
forth for the Information of  
Orthodox Christians  
of the East,*

IN THE FORM OF ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

BY

JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D.,  
BISHOP OF SALISBURY,  
PRESIDENT OF THE ANGLO-CONTINENTAL SOCIETY,  
AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE.

WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERRURY.

[TOGETHER WITH A RUSSIAN VERSION.]

SECOND ENGLISH EDITION, REVISED.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,  
LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1903.



TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF  
ENGLAND ON SOME POINTS  
OF RELIGION

(RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH EDITION)

*Teaching of the Church of England  
on some points of Religion, set  
forth for the Information of  
Orthodox Christians  
of the East,*

IN THE FORM OF ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

BY

JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D.,

BISHOP OF SALISBURY

PRESIDENT OF THE ANGLO-CONTINENTAL SOCIETY  
AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED.

LONDON:

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.



**УЧЕНЕ АНГЛИКАНСКОЙ ЦЕРКВИ  
О НѢКОТОРЫХЪ ПРЕДМЕТАХЪ ВЪРЫ.  
ИЗЛОЖЕННОЕ ДЛЯ ОСВѢДОЛЕНІЯ  
ПРАВОСЛАВНЫХЪ ХРИСТІАНЪ  
ВОСТОКА,**

**ВЪ ФОРМѢ ВОПРОСОВЪ И ОТВѢТОВЪ,**

**ДОКТОРОМЪ БОГОСЛОВІЯ ДЖОНОМЪ УОРДСВОРТОМЪ,  
Епископомъ Салсбурійскимъ,  
Предсѣдателемъ Англо-Континентальнаго Общества,  
и другими членами комитета,**

*СЪ ОДОБРЕНІЯ АРХІЕПИСКОПА КАНТЕРБЮРІЙСКАГО.*

Переведено  
**ПРОФЕССОРОМЪ Н. В. ОРЛОВЫМЪ,**

*Съ Изданія второго, пересмотрѣннаго,*

1901<sup>го</sup> года

Общества покровительства христіанскаго вѣдѣнія,  
въ Лондонѣ.

1903.

# APPROVED.

F. CANTUAR.

June 27, 1900.

---

## CONTENTS

—\*—

	PAGE
APPROVAL OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY . . . . .	4
INTRODUCTION * . . . .	5-8
THE QUESTIONS PROPOSED . . . . .	9
ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS--	
I. ON THE CREEDS, PRAYER-BOOK, CATECHISM, ARTICLES OF RELIGION AND CANONS . . . . .	10-14
II. ON THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH AND ON COUNCILS . . . . .	14-16
III. ON FAITH AND GOOD WORKS AND THE CONDI- TIONS OF SALVATION . . . . .	16, 17
IV. CONCERNING SACRAMENTS (p. 17); AND PAR- TICULARLY ON BAPTISM (p. 20); THE EUCHA- RIST (p. 22); AND HOLY ORDERS (p. 25) . . . . .	17-30
V. CONCERNING PREDESTINATION, THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, AND TRADITION . . . . .	30-32
CONCLUSION . . . . .	32

Одобряется.

ФРЕДЕРИКЪ КАНТУАРСКІЙ.

27го Іюня, 1900 года.

---

## ОГЛАВЛЕНІЕ

---

	СТРАНИЦЫ
Одобреніе Архіепископа Кантербурійскаго . . . . .	4
Введеніе . . . . .	5-8
Перечень предложенныхъ Вопросовъ . . . . .	9
Отвѣты на Вопросы—	
1. О Символахъ вѣры, Книгѣ общественныхъ моленій, Катехизисѣ, Членахъ Религій и о Канолахъ . . . . .	10-14
2. О непогрѣшимости Церкви и о Соборахъ . . . . .	14-16
3. О Вѣрѣ и Добрыхъ Дѣлахъ и объ Условіяхъ Спасенія . . . . .	16, 17
4. Касательно Таинствъ (стр. 17) и въ особен- ности о Крещеніи (стр. 20), Евхаристіи (стр. 22), и Священствѣ (стр. 25) . . . . .	17-30
5. Касательно Предопредѣленія, Исхожденія Св. Духа и Преданія . . . . .	30-32
Заключеніе . . . . .	32

## INTRODUCTION

WE have been asked by friends who are members of the Orthodox Eastern Church to give them fuller information respecting the Church of England, and, in particular, concerning its doctrines on certain points on which there has been from time to time a difference in the apprehension of the faith among certain bodies of Christian people. We respond to this request very willingly, both on account of our great respect for those who have asked us to undertake this task, and our general love for and sympathy with the Christian people of the East, who would we believe find the temper and traditions of the Church of England in many important points in harmony with their own, if they became better acquainted with the beliefs of its members.

It must, in the first place, be observed that there is an Anglican Church both in a broader

## ВВЕДЕНИЕ



Наши друзья изъ среды членовъ Православной Восточной Церкви просили насъ дать имъ болѣе полныя свѣдѣнія касательно Англиканской Церкви и въ особенности касательно ея ученія по тѣмъ пунктамъ, относительно которыхъ въ средѣ извѣстныхъ христіанскихъ обществъ отъ времени до времени появлялась разница въ вѣроученіи. Очень охотно отзываемся на эту просьбу, какъ въ силу великаго уваженія нашего къ тѣмъ, которые приглашали насъ взяться за это дѣло, такъ и по причинѣ любви и симпатій нашихъ къ христіанскому населенію ностока вообще, которое, намъ думается, не преминетъ признать характеръ и традиціи Англиканской Церкви гармонизирующими съ ихъ собственною по многимъ важнымъ пунктамъ, когда лучше познакомится съ вѣрованіями англиканъ.

Прежде всего необходимо замѣтить, что Англиканская Церковь можетъ быть рассматриваема какъ въ широкомъ,

and a narrower sense. There is a world-wide community, including the Church of the United States of America, as well as the Churches of our Communion in Ireland, Scotland, India, Canada, the West Indies, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and other colonies, besides the various native Churches both within and without the dominions of the British Crown. Then there is the Church of England in the narrower sense, namely that of the Kingdom of England, divided into the two Provinces of Canterbury and York, and of the settlements of our countrymen in the foreign jurisdictions committed to the charge of the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Gibraltar, and the Bishop in Jerusalem and the East.

The Anglican Church in both senses is one body, but its parts outside the kingdom of England are ruled by their own archbishops, bishops and synods as free corporations; and their relations with the national Church of England are various, some being very close and definitely binding, while others are more like those created by mutual understanding, such as that with the

такъ и въ болѣе тѣсномъ смыслѣ. Въ первомъ она представляетъ распространенное по всему міру общество и включаетъ въ себѣ какъ Церковь Сѣверо-Американскихъ Соединенныхъ Штатовъ, такъ и состоящая въ общеніи съ нами Церкви въ Ирландіи, Шотландіи, Индіи, Канадѣ, Вестъ-Индіи, Южной Африкѣ, Австраліи, Новой Зеландіи и другихъ Колоніяхъ, равно какъ и разныя туземныя Церкви какъ внутри, такъ и внѣ владѣній Британской Короны. Есть затѣмъ Англиканская Церковь въ болѣе тѣсномъ смыслѣ, а именно: Церковь Англійскаго Королевства, раздѣленная на двѣ провинціи Мантербурійскую и Йоркскую, и Церкви, образуемыя поселеніями нашихъ соотечественниковъ въ иностранныхъ земляхъ и находящіяся въ вѣдѣніи Епископовъ Лондонскаго, Гибралтарскаго и въ Иерусалимѣ Восточнаго.

Въ обоихъ этихъ смыслахъ Англиканская Церковь составляетъ единое тѣло; но ея части, находящіяся внѣ предѣловъ Англійскаго Королевства, состоятъ подъ управленіемъ своихъ собственныхъ Архіепископовъ, Епископовъ и Синодовъ, въ качествѣ свободныхъ корпорацій. Отношенія ихъ къ національной Церкви въ Англии различны:—нѣкоторыя очень близки и опредѣленно-обязательнаго характера, между тѣмъ какъ другія похожи на созданныя взаимнымъ соглашеніемъ, какъ на примѣръ отношенія къ Церкви въ Соединенныхъ

Church of the United States of America. But all are on a most intimate and familiar footing.

This sketch of our constitution will show members of the Orthodox Eastern Church that their position and ours have much in common. There is a real unity of faith and discipline and character of teaching, but great local freedom in the Anglican Church. And this way of regarding the Church of Christ, which is necessarily imposed upon us by the conditions of our organization, enables us, as we believe it enables members of the Orthodox Eastern Church, in the various countries through which it is spread, to approach the problems of the reunion of Christendom with greater hopefulness and patience. We see that local freedom is not only tolerable but helpful, that it brings out the best points of national character, and enlists them in the service of Jesus Christ.

The statements that follow in answer to the questions proposed have not only the approval of the Archbishop (Frederick Temple) of Canterbury, but also that of the Archbishop (William Dalrymple Maclagan) of York (formerly President of the Anglo-Continental Society), and



Штатахъ Сѣверной Америки; по всѣ они самаго тѣснѣйшаго и семейнаго характера.

Предложенный очеркъ нашего устройства покажетъ членамъ Православной Восточной Церкви, что въ нихъ и нашемъ положеніи есть много общаго. Между тѣмъ какъ вообще есть дѣйствительное единеніе въ вѣрѣ, дисциплинѣ и характерѣ ученія, въ Англиканской Церкви существуетъ и великая помѣстная свобода. Такой взглядъ на Церковь Христову, возлагаемый на васъ по необходимости уже самыми условіями нашей организаціи, даетъ возможность какъ намъ, такъ, по нашему мнѣнію, и членамъ Православной Восточной Церкви въ различныхъ странахъ, въ которыхъ она распространена, относиться къ проблемамъ о воссоединеніи Христіанства съ большою увѣренностію и терпѣніемъ. Мы видимъ, что помѣстная свобода не только допустима, но и полезна; она вызываетъ къ обнаруженію наилучшія черты національнаго характера и вербуетъ ихъ на служеніе Иисусу Христу.

Сообщаемыя далѣе свѣдѣнія въ отвѣтъ на предложенные вопросы были одобрены не только Архіепископомъ Кантербурійскимъ (нынѣ покойнымъ Фредерикомъ Темплемъ), но также и Архіепископомъ Торкскимъ (Вильямомъ Дальримплемъ Маклаганомъ, бывшимъ председателемъ Англо-Континентальнаго Общества), и Епи-

of the Bishops of London († Mandel Creighton) and Gibraltar (Charles Waldegrave Sandford), and of the Anglican Bishop (George Popham Blyth) in Jerusalem. We therefore confidently commend them to our readers.

JOHN SARUM,

PRESIDENT OF THE ANGLO-CONTINENTAL SOCIETY.

*June, 1900.*

---

I have to thank Professor N. Orloff, of King's College, London, for his kindness in translating the second edition of this tract into the Russian language. I trust that it may do something to make our position better known to the great Christian people who speak that language, to whom I offer it for consideration with much affection and respect.

J. S.

*September, 1903.*

скопамъ : Лондонскимъ (покойнымъ Манделемъ Крейтеномъ), Гибралтарскимъ (Чарльзомъ Вальдегравомъ Сандфордомъ) и Англиканскимъ въ Иерусалимѣ (Джорджемъ Поингемомъ Бляйтомъ). А потому мы съ полною увѣренностью рекомендуемъ оныя нашимъ читателямъ.

ДЖОНЪ САРУМСКІЙ,

Предѣдатель Англо-Континентальнаго Общества.

Іюнь, 1900 года.

---

Я обязанъ признательностію г. Н. В. Орлову, Профессору Королевской Коллегии въ Лондонѣ, за любезно сдѣланный имъ со втораго изданія сей брошюры переводъ на Русскій языкъ. Надѣюсь, что переводъ послужитъ средствомъ для расширенія и увеличенія знакомства съ нашимъ положеніемъ въ средѣ великаго Христіанскаго народа, который говоритъ на этомъ языкѣ и на обсужденіе котораго мною предлагается эта брошюра съ любовью и уваженіемъ.

Дж. С.

Сентябрь, 1903 года.

## THE QUESTIONS PROPOSED



I. What is the official confession of the Church of England? In what books is it contained, and what is its binding force or validity (*κῦρος*)? . . . . . p. 10

II. What does the Church of England teach about the infallibility of the Church and about the Oecumenical Councils? . . . . . p. 14

III. What does the Church of England teach concerning faith and good works, that is to say, what requirements does it lay down for salvation and justification? . . . . . p. 16

IV. How many Sacraments (*μυστήρια*) does the Church of England receive? What does it teach in general about Sacraments, and in particular concerning Baptism, Eucharist, and Holy Orders (lit. Priesthood)? . . . . . p. 17

V. What does the Church of England teach about predestination, about the procession (*ἐκπορεύσεως*) of the Holy Spirit, and about tradition? . . . . . p. 30

## ПРЕДЛОЖЕННЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ



1. Что признается за официальное вѣроисповѣданіе Англиканской Церкви? Въ какихъ книгахъ оно содержится и какова его обязательная сила или значеніе?

стр. 10.

2. Въ чемъ состоитъ ученіе Англиканской Церкви касательно непогрѣшимости Церкви и о Вселенскихъ Соборахъ? . . . . . стр. 14.

3. Въ чемъ состоитъ ученіе Англиканской Церкви касательно вѣры и добрыхъ дѣлъ, иначе говоря: что считаетъ она необходимымъ для спасенія и оправданія?

стр. 16.

4. Сколько таинствъ (*μυστήρια*) принимаетъ Англиканская Церковь? Въ чемъ состоитъ ея ученіе о таинствахъ вообще и въ особенности о Крещеніи, Евхаристіи и Свидѣнствѣ? . . . . . стр. 17.

5. Въ чемъ состоитъ ученіе Англиканской Церкви относительно предопредѣленія, исхожденія (*ἐκπορεύσεως*) Св. Духа и преданія? . . . . . стр. 30.

## ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS



## I.

What is the official confession of the Church of England? In what books is it contained, and what is its binding force or validity?

The elements of the teaching of the Church of England are found in the three Creeds, that is to say, (1) in the confession of the faith known as the "Nicene Creed<sup>1</sup>," which is constantly recited in the divine Liturgy; (2) in what is called the Apostles' Creed, which is professed by all Candidates at Baptism; and (3) in the hymn which is commonly called the Athanasian Creed.

We receive these Creeds not only because we reverence the ancient tradition of the Church and the Oecumenical Synods, but because we believe that the Holy Scriptures most clearly bear witness to the doctrines contained in them. For we honour the Holy Scriptures as the rule

<sup>1</sup> This is the Creed which was ascribed by the Fathers of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) to the 150 Fathers of Constantinople (A.D. 381). It is now generally supposed by Western scholars to have been originally the baptismal Creed of the Church of Jerusalem. It is of course Nicene in doctrine, but with the addition of certain clauses required by the later growth of heresy.

## ОТВѢТЫ НА ВОПРОСЫ



## 1.

Что признается за официальное вѣроисповѣданіе Англиканской Церкви? Въ какихъ книгахъ оно содержится и какова его обязательная сила или значеніе?

Основанія ученія Англиканской Церкви находятся въ трехъ Символахъ, а именно: (1) въ исповѣданіи вѣры, извѣстномъ подъ именемъ "Никейскаго Символа<sup>1</sup>," который постоянно читается за Божественною Литургією; (2) въ такъ называемомъ Апостольскомъ Символѣ, который читается каждымъ при крещеніи; (3) въ гимнѣ, обыкновенно называемомъ Аванасіевымъ Символомъ.

Мы принимаемъ эти символы не только изъ благоговѣнія передъ древнимъ преданіемъ Церкви и Вселенскими Соборами, но и потому, что полагаемъ, что Священіе Писаніе наяснѣйшимъ образомъ подтверждаетъ содержащееся въ нихъ ученіе. Ибо мы чтимъ Священное Писаніе какъ правило и образецъ божественной истины,

<sup>1</sup> Это то исповѣданіе вѣры, которое Отцами Халкидонскаго собора (451 г.) приписано было 150 Отцамъ, собравшимся въ Константинополь (381 г.). Нынѣ Западные Богословы обыкновенно предполагаютъ, что первоначально это былъ крещальный Символъ Церкви Иерусалимской. Онъ, конечно, вполне никейскій по ученію, но содержитъ, кромѣ того, нѣкоторыя статьи, вызванныя дальнѣйшимъ развитіемъ ересей.

and test [*βάσανος*] of divine truth, by which every form of doctrine, whether derived from ancient tradition or from theological definition, must necessarily be tried.

Further, inasmuch as in our public worship we stand before the Almighty and All-wise God, whom we cannot approach except with entire faith and sincerity, we all consider the teaching contained in our Prayer-book ("The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Church of England: together with the Psalter and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons"), which is in the hands of all, even of our children, to be an official and authoritative expression of the belief of the Church of England. This book had the fullest sanction which it was possible to give it, being ratified first by the Convocations of the two Provinces, and afterwards accepted by an Act of Parliament A. D. 1662. In this book moreover is inserted, between the services for Baptism and that for Confirmation<sup>1</sup> or Laying

<sup>1</sup> The name Confirmation (*βεβαίωσις*) is used by us, as is usual in the Western Church, for the completion of Baptism, elsewhere called Unction (*χρίσμα*) or Sealing (*σφράγισις*). All three names are suggested by St. Paul, 2 Cor. i. 21, 22, "Now he that stablisheth us with you in Christ, and anointed us, is God; who also sealed us, and gave us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts."



которымъ безусловно необходимо испытывать всякій родъ ученія, будетъ ли оно заимствовано изъ древняго преданія или же будетъ выводомъ изъ богословскаго опредѣленія.

Далѣе, такъ какъ за нашимъ Богослуженіемъ мы стоимъ предъ Всемогущимъ и Премудрымъ Богомъ, а приближаться къ Нему можно не иначе, какъ при дѣлостности вѣры и полной искренности, то мы всѣ признаемъ ученіе, содержащееся въ нашемъ Молитвословѣ ("Книга Общественныхъ Моленій и совершенія Таинствъ, равно какъ и другихъ обрядовъ и церемоній Церкви, согласно съ уставомъ Англиканской Церкви, вмѣстѣ съ Книгою Псалмовъ и съ Обрядомъ и способомъ поставленія, возведенія на степени и посвященія Епископовъ, Пресвитеровъ и Діаконовъ"), который находится въ рукахъ всѣхъ и каждаго, даже и дѣтей нашихъ, за официальное и авторитетное выраженіе вѣры Англиканской Церкви. Эта книга получила самую полнѣйшую санкцію, какую только можно было ей дать, такъ какъ первоначально она была ратификована Конвокаціями обѣихъ Провинцій и потомъ принята парламентскимъ актомъ 1662 года. Въ этой книгѣ, сверхъ того, помѣщается между обрядомъ Крещенія и Конфирмацію<sup>1</sup> или возложеніемъ рукъ, Катихизисъ

<sup>1</sup> Названіе Конфирмація (*Βεβαίωσις*) употребляется нами, по обычаю Западной Церкви, въ качествѣ завершения крещенія, иначе помазанію (*χρίσμα*) или запечатлѣнію (*σφράγις*). Всѣ эти названія заимствованы у Св. Павла изъ 2 посл. къ Коринт. і. 21, 22: "Утверждающій же насъ съ вами во Христѣ, и помазавшій насъ есть Богъ, Который и запечатлѣлъ насъ, и далъ залогъ Духа въ сердца наши."

on of Hands, the Catechism or "Instruction to be learned of every person before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop." This Catechism has to be learned by heart by every child and the meaning of it understood. It contains an explanation of the Apostles' Creed, of the Ten Commandments, and of the Lord's Prayer, and it also contains the most necessary information concerning the two great Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion (Eucharist).

Outside the Prayer-book, but usually bound up in one volume together with it, we have "Articles of Religion agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, and the whole Clergy, in the Convocation holden at London in the year 1562, for the avoiding of Diversities of Opinions, and for the establishing of Consent touching true Religion." We have given the full title of these Articles, usually called "the XXXIX Articles," because it describes the object with which they were framed. The XXXIX Articles are definitions to which the clergy give assent in writing, professing by their subscription that they will not teach anything in opposition to them, and that they consider the doctrine contained in them and in the Prayer-book to be agreeable to the word of God.

или "Наставленіе, которое должно быть выучено каждымъ, прежде чѣмъ быть представленнымъ Епископу для конфирмаціи." Этотъ Катихизисъ долженъ быть выученъ на память каждымъ ребенкомъ и смыслъ заученнаго долженъ быть понятъ. Въ немъ содержится изъясненіе Апостольскаго Символа, Десятословія и Молитвы Господней, а также необходимѣйшія свѣдѣнія касательно двухъ великихъ таинствъ Крещенія и Святаго Причащенія (Евхаристіи).

Внѣ этого Молитвенника, но обыкновенно переплетенными вмѣстѣ съ нимъ въ одну книгу оказываются также "Члены Религіи, принятыя Архіепископами и Епископами обѣихъ Провинцій, равно какъ и всѣмъ духовенствомъ, въ собраніи Конвокаціи, происходившемъ въ Лондонѣ въ 1562 году, въ видахъ устраненія разнообразія въ мнѣніяхъ и установленія согласія касательно истинной религіи." Мы выписали полное заглавіе сего документа, который обыкновенно называется "39<sup>ю</sup> Члевами," такъ какъ оно объясняетъ цѣль, съ какою они были составлены. Эти 39 Членовъ суть тѣ опредѣленія, свое согласіе съ коими духовенство утверждаетъ подписью, обязуясь своею подпискою не учить ничему, что было бы противно имъ, и заявляя такимъ образомъ, что содержаемое въ нихъ и въ Молитвословѣ ученіе согласно съ словомъ Божиимъ.

It must be observed that these Articles, though they contain many valuable definitions of Christian truth, are rather "Articles of Religion" than a Confession of Faith. Their main object from the beginning was the preservation of peace and the elimination of certain kinds of error, that "every mouth might be stopped" of those who contentiously disputed, and that so our Church might be at peace within itself. Assent to these Articles is not required of our own lay-people nor necessarily of the clergy of the Churches of our communion which may be established in foreign lands. The synods of these Churches are free to establish what rules they think fit in order to secure the orthodoxy of their clergy and the maintenance of union with the general body of the Anglican Communion.

The XXXIX Articles therefore, considered and examined in an historical light, are a very useful internal bond of union, and are no hindrance to the maintenance of inter-communion and brotherly relations with our fellow Christians of other lands, who have not adopted the errors referred to in these Articles.

Further, the national Church of England has a body of Canons, promulgated mostly in the year 1603, which are binding upon the Clergy

Нужно замѣтить, что хотя эти члены и содержатъ въ себѣ не мало дѣльныхъ опредѣленій христіанской истины они все-таки скорѣе “Параграфы (Статьи), касающіеся вѣры,” но не исповданіе вѣры. Главною задачею ихъ съ самаго начала было поддержаніе мира и устраненіе извѣстнаго рода заблужденій, чтобы “заградить уста” всякому сварливому спорщику и чтобы наша Церковь могла такимъ образомъ обезпечить внутренній миръ. Согласіе съ этими Членами не требуется отъ мірянъ; равно какъ нѣтъ надобности требовать его и отъ духовенства тѣхъ Церквей нашего исповданія, которыя могутъ быть основаны въ иностранныхъ земляхъ. Синоды эти Церквей имѣютъ полное право устанавливать какія имъ будетъ угодно правила для обезпеченія правовѣрія своего духовенства и поддержанія единенія со всѣмъ составомъ Англиканскаго Исповданія.

Обсуждаемые и разсматриваемые съ исторической точки зрѣнія эти 39 Членовъ оказываются такимъ образомъ весьма полезнымъ внутренне-связующимъ звеномъ и не представляютъ никакихъ препятствій для поддержанія взаимныхъ сношеній и братскаго общенія съ тѣми изъ единовѣрныхъ намъ христіанъ въ другихъ странахъ, которые не усвоили заблужденій, упоминаемыхъ въ этихъ Членахъ.

Далѣе, Національная Англійская Церковь имѣетъ рядъ каноновъ, обнародованныхъ въ большей своей части въ 1603 году, которые обязательны для духовен-

and contain in various parts important statements as to doctrine. Other branches of our communion have their own codes of Canons of similar character.

## II.

What does the Church of England teach about the infallibility of the Church and about the Oecumenical Councils?

The Church of England thankfully accepts the general promises of our Lord in Holy Scripture that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church (St. Matt. xvi. 18), that His Spirit will guide His Apostles into all the truth (St. John xvi. 13), and that He will be with His disciples always unto the end of the world (St. Matt. xxviii. 20). It believes that He is present by the power of the Holy Ghost wherever His people are gathered together in His name, not only in public worship, but in the judicial and legislative assemblies of the Church; and that it is the duty of Christians to "hear the Church" (St. Matt. xviii. 15-20). It acknowledges also with thankfulness that the definitions of the faith arrived at by the undisputed Oecumenical Councils are a correct and faithful expression of

ства и содержать по мѣстамъ важныя указанія касательно ученія. Другія вѣтви нашего исповѣданія имѣють свои собственныя собранія канонозъ подобнаго же рода.

## 2.

**Въ чемъ состоитъ ученіе Англиканской Церкви касательно непогрѣшимости Церкви и о Вселенскихъ Соборахъ?**

Англиканская Церковь со благодареніемъ пріемлетъ общія обѣтованія нашего Господа въ Священномъ Писаніи, что врата ада не одолѣють Его Церкви (Мате. хvi. 18), что Духъ Его наставитъ Его Апостоловъ на всякую пелтину (Іоан. хvi. 13) и что Онъ пребудеть съ Своими Учениками во всё дни до скончанія вѣка (Мате. ххviii. 20). Она вѣруеть, что Господь присутствуетъ сплюю Св. Духа повсюду, гдѣ вѣрующіе въ Него собираются во имя Его не только при общественномъ Богослуженіи, но и въ судебныхъ и законодательныхъ собраніяхъ Церкви, и что "послушествовать Церкви" есть долгъ всякаго христіанина (Мате. хviii. 15-20). Она благодарственно признаеть также, что вѣроопредѣленія, составленныя на неспоримо-вселенскихъ Соборахъ, представляютъ правильное и вѣрное выраженіе

the truths respecting the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity in Unity and the Person and Incarnation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and the Person of the Holy Spirit, which from the first have been explicitly or implicitly held within the Church.

This preservation from error is however the work of God, not of men; and infallibility is not inherent in man, nor can it be ascribed beforehand to any person or body of persons however eminent and however numerous. Some other of the most numerous attended Councils of the Church, not Oecumenical, have been betrayed into errors of doctrine. The tests of the validity of the acts of a Council are to be found therefore in their agreement with Scripture and the acceptance of their decrees by the whole body of the Church which thus sets the seal to them after their promulgation.

Further, the Church has always drawn a distinction between articles of faith and decrees on points of discipline and ritual, and it does not attach the same weight to the latter as to the former. For this reason amongst others the Church of England does not consider itself bound by the decrees of the seventh Council (of Nicaea), which were not received, at the time of its meeting, in the Western Church, and



тѣхъ истинъ касательно ученія о Блаженной Троицѣ во Единицѣ, о Лицѣ и Воплощеніи нашего Господа и Спаса Іисуса Христа и о Лицѣ Св. Духа, которыя ясно или подразумѣвательно были содержимы Церковію истинно.

Предохраненіе отъ заблужденій есть, однако, дѣло Божіе, а не дѣло людей; да и непогрѣшимость по свойственна человѣку и не можетъ быть заранѣе приписана какому-либо лицу или же собранію лицъ, какими-бы выдающимся качествами они ни отличались и какъ бы многочисленны они ни были. Нѣкоторые изъ самыхъ многочисленныхъ Соборовъ, не-вселенскихъ, знали въ заблужденіе относительно ученія. Признаками дѣйствительнаго значенія актовъ какого-либо собора должны, потому, быть согласіе самихъ актовъ съ Свящ. Писаніемъ и принятіе соборныхъ опредѣленій всею Церковію, которая такимъ образомъ утверждаетъ (ратификуетъ) ихъ послѣ ихъ обнаруженія.

Далѣе, Церковь всегда дѣтала различіе между вѣроученіемъ и опредѣленіями касательно предметовъ дисциплины и обряда, отнюдь не придавая послѣднимъ такого же значенія, какое имѣютъ догматы. На этомъ основаніи, между прочимъ, Англиканская Церковь не считаетъ обязательными для себя опредѣленія седьмага Собора (Никейскаго), которыя, во время соборныхъ засѣданій, не были приняты Западною Церковію и

which relate to observances which it does not consider helpful or necessary for the people committed to its charge. It admits, however, representations of sacred things and persons into our churches for the purposes of edification; and it condemns any who injure or deface them.

### III.

What does the Church of England teach concerning faith and good works, that is to say, what requirements does it lay down for salvation and justification?

The Church of England teaches, in conformity with Holy Scripture, that "being justified by faith, we have peace with God" (Rom. v. 1). This faith of course reposes in humble confidence upon the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and not upon any merits of our own. But by faith we understand not a dead but a living faith, which as naturally leads the believer to do good works for God as a good tree necessarily bears good fruit. There is no contrast between faith and good works, and there can hardly be said to be any permanent distinction between them, since our blessed Lord teaches: "This is the *work* of God, that ye *believe*

которые касаются Церковныхъ обрядовъ, не признава-  
емыхъ ею за полезныя или необходимыя для вѣрннхъ  
ей водительство членовъ. Она, однако, допускаетъ въ  
свои храмы изображенія священныхъ предметовъ и лицъ  
съ цѣлю назиданія и осуждаетъ тѣхъ, кто наноситъ имъ  
вредъ и кортитъ ихъ.

## 3.

Въ чемъ состоитъ ученіе Англиканской Церкви  
касательно вѣры и добрыхъ дѣлъ, иначе  
говоря: Что считаетъ она необходимымъ  
для спасенія и оправданія?

Англиканская Церковь, согласно съ Свящ. Писаніемъ,  
учитъ, что, “оправдавшись вѣрою, мы имѣемъ миръ  
съ Богомъ” (Римл. v. 1). Эта вѣра, конечно, покоится  
въ смренномъ упованіи на заслугахъ нашего Господа  
и Спасы Иисуса Христа, а не на какихъ-либо нашихъ  
собственныхъ заслугахъ. Но подъ вѣрою мы не разумѣ-  
емъ какую-либо мертвую, но живую вѣру, которая также  
естественно ведетъ вѣрующаго къ содѣянію добрыхъ  
дѣлъ для Бога, какъ хорошее дерево по необходимости  
приноситъ добрый плодъ. Контраста между вѣрою  
и добрыми дѣлами здѣсь вовсе нѣтъ, да едва ли и вообще  
можно находить между ними какое-нибудь постоянное  
различіе, въ виду того, что Господь нашъ Сказалъ:  
“Вотъ, *дѣло* Божіе, чтобы вы *вѣровали* въ Того, Кого

on him whom he hath sent" (St. John vi. 29). Good works are properly contrasted with bad or selfish or dead works, not with any Christian grace.

Further, it teaches that repentance, faith, and obedience to the divine will are necessary conditions for the reception of the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist which are generally necessary to salvation.

Without professing to limit the power of divine grace it knows no other conditions of salvation than these; but it teaches its children to hope that those who turn their hearts to God in sickness with purpose of amendment are really in the way of obedience to the divine will even if they are not allowed time to do outward acts which would give evidence of their faith.

#### IV.

How many Sacraments (mysteries) does the Church of England receive? What does it teach in general about Sacraments, and in particular concerning Baptism, Eucharist, and Holy Orders (lit. Priesthood)?

Everything which reveals God to man and elevates man to God, whether in created nature or in the orderly life of the Church, is in a true

Огнь послать" (Іоан. vi. 29). Добрыя дѣла совершенно правильно противоплагаются дурнымъ, или эгоистическимъ, или мертвящимъ дѣламъ, но отнюдь не какому-либо христіанскому благодатному дару.

Далѣе, она учитъ, что покаяніе, вѣра и послушаніе божественному велѣнію составляютъ необходимыя условія для принятія двухъ таинствъ Крещенія и Евхаристіи, которыя вообще необходимы ко спасенію.

Отнюдь не желая ограничивать силу божественной благодати, она не знаетъ никакихъ другихъ условій для спасенія, кромѣ выше означенныхъ; но она учитъ своихъ дѣтей надѣяться, что и тѣ, кои въ болѣзни обращаютъ сердца свои къ Богу съ твердымъ намѣреніемъ исправленія, поставляются на пути дѣйствительнаго послушанія божественному велѣнію, даже и тогда, когда у нихъ не оказывается времени для совершенія наружныхъ дѣйствій, которыя бы проявили ихъ вѣру.

## 4.

Сколько таинствъ (mysteria) принимаетъ Англиканская Церковь? Въ чемъ состоитъ ея ученіе о таинствахъ вообще и въ особенности о Крещеніи, Евхаристіи и Священствѣ?

Все, что открываетъ Бога человѣку и возвышаетъ послѣдняго къ Богу,—будетъ ли это въ самой природѣ или же въ упорядоченной жизни Церкви,—таинственно въ

sense sacramental. Both the order and the beauty of nature are intended by God to minister to the religious life of man. Thus also the word of God read and preached, and the prayers of faithful Christians, public and private, have a distinctly sacramental character. The gathering together of two or three believers in Christ's Name brings us the wonderful blessing of His presence.

But the question appears to refer to a narrower circle of sacred acts. Sacraments in this sense may be defined as solemn and sacred acts done at certain specified times and under certain conditions in the name of God, in agreement with the teaching of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and in humble reliance on the power of the Holy Spirit, in which an outward and visible sign is both the symbol and instrument of an inward and spiritual grace. In regard to these the Church of England has not laid down an exact numeration. It recognizes, however, that two of them are superior in dignity to the others, as being clearly ordained by Christ Himself during His earthly ministry, and as being, according to His own teaching, generally [i. e. to all] necessary to salvation (St. John iii. 5; vi. 53). These it is accustomed to call "the two great Sacraments," or "the Sacraments of the Gospel."

Besides these, it most solemnly administers

истинномъ смыслѣ. Какъ порядокъ въ природѣ, такъ и красота ея самимъ Богомъ предназначены на служеніе религиозной жизни человѣка. Такимъ же образомъ и слово Божіе, когда его читаютъ или проповѣдаютъ, равно какъ и молитвы вѣрующахъ христіанъ—общественныя и частныя—принимаютъ отличительно—сакраментальный характеръ. Собраніе вмѣстѣ двухъ или трехъ вѣрующахъ во имя Христа сопровождается дивнымъ благословеніемъ Его присутствія.

Но вопросъ по-видимому имѣетъ отношеніе къ болѣе тѣсному кругу священныхъ дѣйствій. Таинства въ этомъ смыслѣ могутъ быть опредѣляемы какъ торжественныя и священныя дѣйствія, совершаемыя въ онредѣленно назначенныя времена и при извѣстныхъ условіяхъ во имя Божіе, согласно съ ученіемъ Господа и Спася нашего Иисуса Христа и въ смиренномъ упованіи на силу Св. Духа, при чемъ вѣншній и видимый знакъ есть и символъ и орудіе внутренней духовной благодати. Касательно таковыхъ Англиканская Церковь не установила точнаго числа таинствъ. Она признаетъ, однако, что два изъ нихъ выше другихъ по достоинству, такъ какъ они были ясно установлены самимъ Христомъ во время земнаго Его служенія и, согласно Его собственному ученію, всеобще необходимы для спасенія (Іоан. iii. 5 ; vi. 53). Ихъ-то обычно принято называть : “двумя великими таинствами” или “таинствами евангельскими.”

Кромѣ этихъ, Англиканская Церковь наиторжественнѣй-

Ordination, as the guarantee for the preservation of the deposit of the faith, for the good government of the Church and the valid administration of the Sacraments. It attaches great importance to Confirmation as the natural complement to holy Baptism. It acknowledges the sacredness of Christian marriage, and provides for its celebration in the face of the Church and its blessing by a priest. It solemnly applies to the penitent, both publicly and privately, the reconciling power of the Saviour. It provides a special office for the Visitation of the Sick, with prayers for the sick man's recovery, and it enjoins upon its bishops in particular to "heal the sick" (see p. 29). All these rites it holds to be essential to the due order of the Church of Christ, and to be ordinary means of grace which have an abiding position in reference to the life of the Church.

Besides these acts, which have a special right to be called sacramental, it also provides sacred offices for the thanksgiving of women after childbirth, and for the burial of the dead; and it consecrates churches and their contents, and churchyards or cemeteries for the burial of the dead, setting them apart for ever from profane and unhallowed uses.

We believe that the Holy Spirit, in fulfilment



шимъ образомъ совершаетъ посвященіе, какъ гарантію поддержанія залога вѣры, добраго управленія въ Церкви и дѣйствительнаго совершенія таинствъ. Она придаетъ большое значеніе Конфирмаціи, какъ естественному завершенію Св. Крещенія. Она признаетъ святость Христіанскаго Брака и дѣлаетъ распоряженіе о совершеніи его предъ лицомъ всей Церкви и о священническомъ его благословеніи. Она торжественно пользуется въ отношеніи къ кающемуся—открыто ли, или наединѣ—примиряющею силою Спасителя. Она предназначаетъ нарочитую службу для посѣщенія больныхъ, съ молитвами объ исцѣленіи болящаго, и повелѣваетъ особенно своимъ Епископамъ “исцѣлять недужныхъ (см. стр. 29). Всѣ эти обряды она считаетъ за существенно-важные для правильнаго устройства Церкви Христовой и за обязательныя орудія благодати, которыя занимаютъ пребывающее положеніе въ связи съ жизнью Церкви.

Кромѣ сихъ священнодѣйствій, которыя имѣютъ преимущественное право на названіе таинственныхъ, Церковь предлагаетъ еще священныя службы для женщинъ послѣ родовъ и для погребенія умершихъ; она освящаетъ также храмы съ ихъ принадлежностями и кладбища какъ при церквахъ, такъ и отдѣльныя для погребенія умершихъ, навсегда отдѣляя оныя такимъ образомъ отъ мірскаго и ненадлежащаго пользованія.

Мы вѣруемъ что Святыи Духъ, во исполненіе обѣто-

of our Saviour's promise, has led the Church universal to a general agreement on these points, an agreement visible under certain differences of detail, and that these acts are all in their degree effectual signs [*efficacia signa*] of grace. This way of looking at the matter is implied in the title of our Prayer-book, which is, as we have already quoted it, p. 11: "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church [i. e. of the Church universal], according to the Use of the Church of England," &c. In regard also to Ceremonies abolished and retained by us, the Preface to our Prayer-book says expressly: "In these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anytbing but to our own people only: for we think it convenient that every country should use such Ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition."

*With regard particularly to Baptism, the Eucharist, and Holy Orders, the Church of England teaches as follows:—*

1. *As regards holy Baptism, it teaches that Baptism must always be administered with water into the name of the blessed Trinity, the Father,*

ванія нашего Спасителя, привелъ вселенскую Церковь ко всеобщему согласію относительно этихъ пунктовъ, котораго нельзя не замѣтить при извѣстномъ разнообразіи въ подробностяхъ, и что эти священныя дѣйствія суть, каждое въ своей мѣрѣ, дѣйственыя знаменія благодати. Такой взглядъ на дѣло выражается въ заглавіи нашего Молитвослова, которое, какъ мы уже обозначили на стр. 17, читается такъ: “Книга Общественныхъ Моленій и совершенія Таинствъ, равно какъ и другихъ обрядовъ и церемоній Церкви (т. е. Церкви вселенской), согласно съ уставомъ Англиканской Церкви,” и пр. Равнымъ образомъ касательно церемоній, отмѣненныхъ или удержанныхъ нами, предисловіе къ нашему Молитвослову прямо говоритъ: “Такъ поступаая, мы не осуждаемъ людей другихъ національностей и не предписываемъ имъ ничего, ограничиваясь лишь своимъ собственнымъ народомъ и признавая умѣстнымъ, чтобы всякая страна заводила у себя такія церемоніи, какія кажутся ей наилучшими для почитанія и прославленія Бога и для приведенія своего народа къ совершеннѣйшей и божественной жизни, свободной отъ заблужденія или суевѣрія.”

*Въ частности касательно Крещенія, Евхаристіи и степеней Священства* Англиканская Церковь учитъ слѣдующимъ образомъ :

1. *Касательно св. Крещенія* она учитъ, что Крещеніе должно быть всегда совершаемо при посредствѣ воды во имя Преподобной Троицы, Отца и Сына и Св.

the Son, and the Holy Ghost, according to our Lord's command (St. Matt. xxviii. 19). It recommends Baptism by immersion, but permits Baptism by affusion; it provides for Baptism by a priest (subject, in the case of adults, to the direction of the bishop), or in the priest's absence by a deacon; but it does not invalidate Baptism by a layman, if it be properly performed.

It teaches that the Baptism of young children is to be retained as most agreeable with the institution of Christ. It orders that such children should be brought to the font by three sponsors, two of the same sex as the child and one of the other sex.

*As regards the effect of Baptism*, it teaches that it is a death to sin and a new birth unto righteousness, and comprehends gifts that by nature we cannot have. In it we are regenerated and made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. Baptism cannot be repeated. Its proper complement is Confirmation, which is administered among us only to those who have arrived at years of discretion. All who bring children to Baptism are directed to see that they are afterwards brought to Confirmation.

Confirmation among us is always ministered by a bishop in person, with prayer for the seven-

Духа, согласно вѣщанію нашего Господа (Мате. ххviii. 19). Она рекомендуетъ совершать Крещеніе чрезъ погруженіе, но дозволяетъ и обливаніе; она предоставляетъ совершеніе Священнику (который, въ случаѣ крещенія взрослыхъ, долженъ испросить указанія Епископа), а въ случаѣ его отсутствія Діакону; но не считаетъ не дѣйствительнымъ крещенія и отъ мірянина, если только оно совершено, какъ слѣдуетъ.

Церковь учитъ, что крещеніе младенцевъ должно быть удержано, такъ какъ оно исполнѣе согласно съ установленіемъ Христовымъ. Она повелѣваетъ, чтобы дѣти были приносимы къ купели тремя воспріименками, изъ коихъ двое должны быть тогоже пола, какъ и младенецъ, а третій иного пола.

*Касательно дѣйствія Крещенія*, она учитъ, что это смерть для грѣха и новое рожденіе для праведности и обнимаетъ такіе дары, которыхъ мы не можемъ имѣть отъ природы. Въ крещеніи мы возрождаемся и становимся членами Христовыми, чадами Божіими и наследниками Царствія небеснаго. Крещеніе не можетъ быть повторяемо. Надлежащее завершеніе его составляетъ Конфирмація, которая совершается у насъ только надъ лицами, достигшими разсудочнаго возраста. Всѣмъ, приносящимъ дѣтей къ крещенію, повелѣвается озаботиться о приведеніи ихъ въ свое время для Конфирмаціи.

Конфирмація у насъ всегда совершается лично Епископомъ, съ молитвою о седмеричномъ дарѣ Св. Духа

fold gift of the Holy Spirit (Isaiah xi. 2). The prayer is followed by solemn imposition of hands and blessing.

2. *As regards the Eucharist*, it teaches that pure wheaten bread and wine, being the fermented juice of the grape, are the necessary elements of the Sacrament. The bread most commonly used is leavened; but unleavened bread is not prohibited<sup>1</sup>. The wine may be pure, or mixed with water. No one but a bishop or presbyter may consecrate the Eucharist.

The following are the *forms of consecration and administration* in the national Church of England:—

“Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption: who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again; Hear us, O mer-

<sup>1</sup> It may be observed that the Prayer-book orders, in the rubrics about the Bread, “It shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usual to be eaten: but the best and purest Wheat Bread that conveniently may be gotten.”

(Ис. хі. 2). За молитвою слѣдуетъ торжественное возложеніе рукъ и благословеніе.

2. *Касательно Евхаристіи* Церковь учитъ, что чисто-пшеничный хлѣбъ и вино изъ перебродившаго винограднаго сока составляютъ необходимые элементы сего таинства. По большей части употребляется хлѣбъ квасный, но опрѣсочный хлѣбъ не запрещается<sup>1</sup>. Вино можетъ быть чистымъ или смѣшаннымъ съ водою. Никто, кромѣ Епископа или Священника, не можетъ совершать Евхаристіи.

*Формулы освященія и причащенія* Національной Церкви въ Англїи слѣдующія :

“О Боже всемогущій, небесный нашъ Отецъ, по Твоему любвеобильному милосердію предавший на крестную смерть для нашего искупленія Единороднаго Сына Твоего Іисуса Христа, Который (единнымъ принесеніемъ Самого Себя въ жертву) совершилъ на крестѣ полное, совершенное и достаточное пожертвованіе, приношеніе и удовлетвореніе за грѣхи всего міра, и установилъ, а въ святомъ Своемъ Евангелїи повелѣлъ намъ продолжать это всегдашнее воспоминаніе о сей драгоценной Его смерти до втораго

<sup>1</sup> Но мѣшаетъ замѣтить, что Молитвословъ въ указаніяхъ относительно хлѣба дѣлаетъ такое распоряженіе: “Будетъ достаточно, если хлѣбъ будетъ такимъ, какой обыкновенно употребляется въ пищу; но онъ долженъ быть лучшимъ и чистѣйшимъ пшеничнымъ хлѣбомъ, какой окажется возможнымъ достать.”

ciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood: who, in the same night that he was betrayed, [*Here the Priest is to take the Paten into his hands*] took Bread; and, when he had given thanks [*And here to break the bread*], he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, [*And here to lay his hand upon all the Bread*] this is my Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he [*Here he is to take the Cup into his hand*] took the Cup; and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this [*And here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any Wine to be consecrated*] is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. Amen."

*The forms of administration are as follows:—*

"The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in



Его пришествія, — услыши, Милосердый Отче, пасть, смиренно умоляющихъ Тебя, и даждь, чтобы, пріемля сія Твоя созданія хлѣбъ и вино, согласно святому уставленію Твоего Сына, нашего Спасителя Іисуса Христа, въ воспоминаніе Его смерти и страстей, мы содѣлались причастниками Его Пречистаго Тѣла и Крови, Который въ ту ночь, когда Онъ былъ преданъ (*При этомъ Священникъ долженъ взять въ руки дискосъ*), взялъ хлѣбъ и, возблагодаривъ (*При этомъ долженъ раздробить хлѣбъ*), преломилъ его и далъ ученикамъ Своимъ, говоря: Примите, ядите (*При этомъ онъ долженъ возложить руку на весь находящійся на дискосъ хлѣбъ*): сіе есть Тѣло Мое, которое за васъ предается. Сіе творите въ Мое воспоминаніе. Подобнымъ же образомъ, послѣ вечера, Онъ (*При этомъ священнодѣйствующій долженъ взять въ руку чашу*) взялъ чашу и, возблагодаривъ, далъ ее имъ, говоря: Пейте изъ нея все, ибо сія (*При этомъ онъ долженъ возложить руку на всякій сосудъ—чашу ли, или стклянку—съ виномъ, подлежащимъ освященію*) есть Кровь Моя Новаго Завѣта, которая изливается за васъ и за многихъ во оставленіе грѣховъ. Сіо творите всякій разъ, когда только будете пить, въ Мое воспоминаніе. Аминь.”

*Формы причащенія слѣдующія :*

“Тѣло нашего Господа Іисуса Христа, которое предано было за тебя, да сохранишь твое тѣло и душу для вѣчной жизни. Примми и яждь сіе въ воспоминаніе, что

remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving."

"The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's Blood was shed for thee, and be thankful."

Then follows the Lord's Prayer, to be said by the Priest: the people repeating every petition after him.

The following prayer describes the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharistic service:—

"O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee, that all we, who are partakers of this holy Communion, may be filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction. And although we be

Христось умеръ за тебя, и питайся имъ въ сердцѣ твоёмъ вѣрою со благодареніемъ.”

“Кровь нашего Господа Іисуса Христа, которая была пролита за тебя, да сохранитъ твое тѣло и душу для вѣчной жизни. Пей сіе въ воспоминаніе, что кровь Христова была пролита за тебя, и приноси благодареніа.”

За сѣмъ слѣдуетъ молитва Госводня. Ее читаетъ Священникъ, а народъ повторяетъ за нимъ каждое прошеніе.

Слѣдующая молитва взображаетъ жертвенную сторону Евхаристическаго Богослуженія:

“О Госводи и небесный Отче! Мы Твои смиренныя рабы всецѣло желаемъ, чтобы Ты, по Своей отеческой благодати, милостиво пріимь сію нашу жертву хвалы и благодаренія, и всеумилевнѣйше Тебя просимъ даровать дабы, во силѣ заслугъ и смерти Твоего Сына Іисуса Христа и чрезъ вѣру въ кровь Его, мы и вся Церковь Твоя могли получить оставленіе грѣховъ, равво какъ в всѣ другіе плоды Его страстей. При сѣмъ мы предлагаемъ и представляемъ Тебѣ, Господи, насъ самихъ, наши души в тѣла, въ качествѣ умнаго, святаго и живаго жертвоприношенія Тебѣ, смиренно моля Тебя, чтобы всѣ мы приобщающіеся сему Святому причащенію, исполнились Твоей благодати и небеснаго благословенія. И хотя, по множеству грѣховъ нашихъ, мы недостойны предложить

unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. *Amen.*"

As to the *effect of the Sacrament*: we believe and teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed given, taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, and that through this Sacrament we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we are one with Christ and Christ with us. But we discourage scholastic<sup>1</sup> definitions as to the mode and manner of Christ's presence, which we acknowledge to be true and genuine and therefore after a mysterious, ineffable and spiritual manner.

3. *As regards Holy Orders.* Our Church teaches in the Preface to the Ordinal, which forms a part of our Book of Common Prayer, that "It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from

<sup>1</sup> "Scholastic" here is intended to refer to the far-fetched interpretations and the over subtle and too systematic methods of certain Western theologians called Schoolmen, from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries.

Тебѣ какую бы то ни было жертву, тѣмъ не менѣе мы умоляемъ Тебя принять сей нашъ непремѣнный долгъ и службу, не взвѣсивъ заслугъ нашихъ, но прощая наши прегрѣшенія, ради Іисуса Христа нашего Господа, чрезъ Коего и съ Коемъ въ единеніи со Св. Духомъ, да воздается Тебѣ, Отче Всемогущій, всякая честь и слава до скончанія вѣка. Аминь.”

Касательно *дѣйствія таинства* мы вѣруемъ и учимъ, что тѣло и кровь Христовы истинно и дѣйствительно преподаются, берутся и принимаются вѣрующими за Господнюю вечерю и что чрезъ это таинство мы обитаемъ во Христѣ и Христосъ въ насъ, что мы становимся едино со Христомъ и Христосъ съ нами. Но мы не придаемъ никакого значенія схоластическимъ<sup>1</sup> опредѣленіямъ касательно способа и вида присутствія Хридова, которое признаемъ истиннымъ и подлиннымъ, а потому въ видѣ таинственномъ, непзроченномъ и духовномъ.

3. *Касательно степеней Свящества.* Наша Церковь учитъ въ предисловіи къ службѣ, которое составляетъ часть нашей Книги Общественныхъ Моленій, что, “какъ съ очевидностью ясно всякому, тщательно изучающему Священное Писаніе и древнихъ авторовъ, со времени Апостольскихъ существовали сіи степени Свя-

<sup>1</sup> Терминомъ “схоластическій” имѣется въ виду указать на натянутыя объясненія, слишкомъ тонкіе и до крайности систематизированные приемы извѣстныхъ западныхъ богослововъ, называвшихся схоластиками и процвѣтавшихъ отъ одинадцатаго до пятнадцатаго столѣтія.

the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore held in such reverend Estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority. And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of *England*; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of *England*, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination."

The pre-requisites for ordination in the Church of England are proper age and mental and bodily capacity, soundness in the faith, sufficient learning, good character, and approval, either expressed or reasonably to be presumed, on the part of the people, and a sufficient "title" or sphere of work.

The *essentials of a valid Ordination* are the presence and ministry of the proper minister and

щенства въ Церкви Христовой, а именно: Епископовъ, Священниковъ и Діаконовъ. Эти должности всегда содержимы были въ столь великомъ почтеніи, что никто не осмѣливался братья за неправленіе ихъ, если прежде не былъ призываемъ, испытываемъ и не оказывался обладателемъ потребныхъ для того качествъ и если, кромѣ того, чрезъ общественное моленіе и возложеніе рукъ не былъ одобряемъ и допускаемъ къ тому законною властію. А потому, въ тѣхъ видахъ, чтобы степени эти продолжались, съ благоговѣніемъ принимались и были достоительно почитаемы въ нашей Церкви *въ Англии*, никто не долженъ быть почитаемъ или принимаемъ за Епископа, Священника или Діакона въ Церкви *Англійской*, или же допускаемъ до отправленія какихъ-либо изъ вышесказанныхъ обязанностей, если не будетъ призванъ, испытанъ, проэкзаменованъ и допущенъ къ тому, огласно съ нижеслѣдующею формулою, или же не получитъ ранѣе Епископскаго посвященія или возведенія въ степень.”

Предварительныя условія для возведенія въ степени въ Англійской Церкви суть: подлежащій возрастъ, духовная и тѣлесная пригодность, здравая вѣра, достаточная ученость, доброе имя, одобреніе — прямо выраженное или же основательно предполагаемое — со стороны народа и достаточное “право” или сфера дѣятельности.

*Существенныя принадлежности дѣйствительнаго посвященія* суть: присутствіе и священнодѣй

the use of suitable prayer with laying on of hands.

A Deacon amongst us is ordained by a bishop alone. A Presbyter is ordained by a bishop with the assistance of other presbyters who take part in the laying on of hands, though the bishop alone says the prayer and the forms which accompany and follow the laying on of hands. An Archbishop or Bishop is consecrated by three or more bishops.

The work of a *Deacon* is to assist the priest in divine service and in the relief of the poor: he is permitted to baptize in the absence of the priest, to read the Gospel and to assist in the administration of the Eucharist, and to preach if he receives the bishop's licence.

A *Presbyter* is ordained to the "stewardship" and "ministry of the Word and Sacraments."

As a "steward" or "dispenser" he has to consider to whom and on what occasions he will minister. He is also described as a "messenger and watchman of the Lord." As a "minister" of the Word and Sacraments he is bound by the canons and liturgical rules of the Church in the manner of his ministration.

As a sign of office the Deacon receives the New Testament at his ordination; the Presbyter and the Bishop each receive a Bible.



ствіе надлежащаго священнослужителя и употребленіе подлежащей молитвы съ возложеніемъ рукъ.

Діаконъ посвящается у насъ однимъ Епископомъ. Священникъ же Епископомъ при содѣйствіи другихъ Священниковъ, которые принимаютъ участіе въ возложеніи рукъ, хотя одинъ Епископъ читаетъ молитву и произноситъ формулы, предшествующія возложенію рукъ и слѣдующія за нимъ. Архіепископъ же или Епископъ посвящаются тремя или болѣе Епископами.

Обязанности *Діакона* состоятъ во вспоможеніи Священнику при совершеніи божественныхъ службъ и при оказаніи вспоможенія бѣднымъ. Ему разрѣшается совершать крещеніе за отсутствіемъ Священника, читать Евангеліе, помогать при причащеніи мірянъ и проповѣдывать слово Божіе, если онъ получитъ на то Епископское дозволеніе.

*Священникъ* поставляется на “домостроительство” и “служеніе слову и таинствамъ.”

Въ качествѣ “домостроителя” или “управляющаго,” ему приходится принимать во вниманіе, — кому и въ какихъ случаяхъ онъ будетъ служить. Онъ называется также “вѣстникомъ и стражемъ Господнимъ.” Какъ “служитель” слова и таинствъ, онъ связанъ канонами Церкви и литургическими указаніями относительно способа совершенія богослуженія.

Въ качествѣ знака своей должности Діаконъ получаетъ при своемъ посвященіи Новый Заветъ; а Священникъ и Епископъ получаютъ по Библии.

*Bishops* have in addition to the duties and privileges which they received as presbyters, special powers of ordaining, confirming, teaching and government assigned to them.

The distinction between the work of the three Orders will be made clear by the forms which accompany and follow the laying on of hands in each case:—

1. *For a deacon at the laying on of hands:* "Take thou Authority to execute the Office of a Deacon in the Church of God committed unto thee; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

*At the delivery of the New Testament:* "Take thou Authority to read the Gospel in the Church of God, and to preach the same, if thou be thereto licensed by the Bishop himself. Amen."

2. *For a priest at the laying on of hands:* "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy Sacraments; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

*At the delivery of the Bible:* "Take thou

*Епископы* по-мимо обязанностей и преимуществъ священническихъ, полученныхъ ими при посвященіи, имѣють, сверхъ того, особенныя полномочія на посвященіе, конфирмацію, ученіе и управленіе.

Разница между обязанностями всѣхъ трехъ степеней Священства ясно открывается изъ формулъ, кои сопровождаютъ въ каждомъ случаѣ возложеніе рукъ и слѣдуютъ за нимъ :

1. *При поставленіи во Діакона и возложеніи рукъ*: “Пріими власть исполнять въ Церкви Божіей должность Діакона, порученную тебѣ, во имя Отца и Сына и Св. Духа. Аминь.”

*При врученіи Новаго Завета*: “Пріими власть читать Евангеліе въ Церкви Божіей и проповѣдывать оно, если получишь на то разрѣшеніе отъ твоего Епископа. Аминь.”

2. *При поставленіи во Священника и возложеніи рукъ*: “Пріими Духа Св. для должности и дѣла Священника въ Церкви Божіей, нынѣ ввѣренныхъ тебѣ чрезъ возложеніе нашихъ рукъ. Кому ты простишь грѣхи, тому они простятся; а на комъ ты оставишь грѣхи, на томъ они останутся. Будь же вѣрнымъ раздаятелемъ слова Божія и святыхъ Его таинствъ, во имя Отца и Сына и Св. Духа. Аминь.”

*При врученіи Библии*: “Пріими власть проповѣ-

Authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the holy Sacraments in the Congregation, where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto."

3. *For an archbishop or bishop at the laying on of hands:* "Receive the Holy Ghost, for the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by this Imposition of our hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness<sup>1</sup>."

*At the delivery of the Bible:* "Give heed unto reading, exhortation, and doctrine. Think upon the things contained in this Book. Be diligent in them, that the increase coming thereby may be manifest unto all men. Take heed unto thyself, and to doctrine, and be diligent in doing them: for by so doing thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee<sup>1</sup>. Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd, not a wolf; feed them, devour them not. Hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind up the broken, bring again the out-casts, seek the lost. Be so merciful, that you be not too remiss; so minister discipline, that you

<sup>1</sup> See 2 Tim. i. 7 and 1 Tim. iv. 15, 16.

дывать слово Божіе и совершать святых таинства въ приходѣ, въ который ты будешь для того законно назначенъ.”

3. При поставленіи Архіепископа или Епископа и возложеніи рукъ: “Прими Св. Духа для должности и дѣла Епископа въ Церкви Божіей, пинѣ вѣрныя тебѣ чрезъ возложеніе нашихъ рукъ, во имя Отца и Сына и Св. Духа. Аминь. И не забывай возгрѣвать благодать Божію, которая дается тебѣ симъ возложеніемъ нашихъ рукъ, ибо Богъ далъ намъ не духа боязни, но духа силы, любви и цѣломудрія<sup>1</sup>.”

При врученіи Библии: “Внимай чтенію, вразумленію, ученію. Помыслиай о вещахъ, содержащихся въ сей книгѣ. Будь тщателенъ въ нихъ, дабы успѣхъ, происходящій отъ того, былъ для всехъ очевиденъ. Вникай въ себя и въ ученіе и старайся тщательно исполнять его, ибо, такъ поступая, и себя спасешь и слушающихъ тебя<sup>1</sup>. Будь для стада Христова пастыремъ, а не волкомъ; питай оное, а не пожирай. Поддерживай слабыхъ, исцѣляй больныхъ, возставляй падшихъ, приводи обратно изверженныхъ, отыскивай заблудшихъ. Будь милосердъ, но такъ, чтобы не быть нерадивымъ; блюди за порядкомъ, но не забывай о милости, такъ чтобы, при появленіи Пастыреначаль-

<sup>1</sup> См. 2 Тим. i. 7 и 1 Тим. iv. 15, 16.

forget not mercy ; that when the chief Shepherd shall appear you may receive the never-fading crown of glory ; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

These forms of ordination are the same in all branches of the Anglican Church.

## V.

**What does the Church of England teach about predestination, about the procession of the Holy Spirit, and about tradition ?**

1. *Concerning predestination*, our Church teaches, in conformity with Scripture, that it is God's will that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. ii. 4); and that therefore we are bound to assist Him to the best of our power by spreading the knowledge of His Gospel among all nations, and by bringing the ignorant and sinful to their Saviour.

Yet as a matter of fact it appears that God does not intend that all should come to this knowledge at once ; but rather gradually through the operation of the Holy Spirit using human instruments for the conversion of the ignorant and sinful. Those who thus become members of His Church are in the first sense of the terms the "called" and the "elect." Yet in these free-will is not destroyed, and they can, if they

ника, ты могъ получить неуязвимый вѣнецъ славы, ради Іисуса Христа нашего Господа. Амшъ.”

Эти формулы поставленія на степени Священства тождественны у всѣхъ вѣтвей Англиканской Церкви.

## 5.

**Въ чемъ состоитъ ученіе Англиканской Церкви о предопредѣленіи, исхожденіи Св. Духа и о преданіи?**

1. *Касательно предопредѣленія* наша Церковь учитъ согласно съ Писаніемъ, что такова воля Божія чтобы всѣ люди спаслись и достигли познанія истины (1 Тим. ii. 4), и что, потому, мы должны содѣйствовать Ему до послѣдней нашей возможности распространеніемъ вѣдѣнія Его Евангелія между всѣми народами и приведеніемъ невѣдущихъ и грѣшниковъ къ ихъ Спасителю.

Однакоже, какъ оказывается на дѣлѣ, Богу не благоугодно, чтобы всѣ достигли сразу этого познанія, а — напротивъ — скорѣе съ постепенностію чрезъ содѣйствіе Св. Духа, пользующагося человѣческими орудіями для обращенія невѣждъ и грѣшниковъ. Тѣ, которые такимъ образомъ становятся членами Его Церкви, суть, въ первоначальномъ смыслѣ словъ, “званные” и “избранные.” Однакоже, свободная воля въ нихъ не уничто-

will, resist divine grace. Therefore they are to be warned according to the words of St. Peter (2 Pet. i. 10), "to be earnest to make their calling and election sure." The number of those who will persevere to the end is a secret known only to God, and our Church teaches that it is dangerous to attempt to penetrate this secret, for to do so may easily lead to vanity and carelessness or to despair.

2. *Concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit.*  
We acknowledge that the Father is the one beginning, cause and source of the Godhead, and that from Him the Holy Spirit issues.

The Holy Spirit issues out of the Father through the coeternal Son, and He is the eternal bond of union between them, and through the Son He is united to the Father.

We have accepted the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed as it was delivered to us by our fathers, and we so continue to recite it in the Liturgy. We have also reasons to allege on behalf of the orthodoxy of the expression which is in question in itself, which need not be discussed in this short exposition of our teaching. But, as regards the text of the Creed, we acknowledge that the words "and the Son" were introduced into it in an irregular manner. We therefore think it sufficient here to affirm that



жаются, и они могут, если пожелаютъ, противодействовать божественной благодати. А потому ихъ слѣдуетъ предостерегать, согласно съ словами Св. Петра (2 Пет. i, 10), "Болѣе и болѣе стараться дѣлать твердымъ свое званіе и избраніе." Число тѣхъ, которые до конца преуспѣютъ, составляетъ тайну, извѣстную лишь одному Богу, и наша Церковь учитъ, что опасно пытаться проникнуть эту тайну, ибо, такъ поступаая, легко можно быть доведеннымъ до тщеславія и небреженія или же до отчаянія.

2. *Касательно исхожденія Св. Духа.* Мы исповѣдуемъ, что Отецъ есть единое начало, вѣна и источникъ Божества и что Духъ Св. происходитъ отъ Него.

Духъ Св. исходитъ отъ Отца чрезъ совѣчнаго Сына и есть вѣчное звѣно единенія между Ними; чрезъ Сына же онъ соединяется съ Отцемъ.

Мы приняли Никео-Константинопольскій Символъ, какъ онъ былъ переданъ намъ нашими отцами; такъ мы и продолжаемъ читать его въ Литургіи. У насъ есть также основанія, которыя могли бы быть приведены въ пользу православности выраженія, составляющаго предметъ спора; но мы не видимъ надобности въ подробности обсуждать оныя въ семь краткомъ изложеніи нашего ученія. Въ отношеніи же къ самому тексту Символа мы признаемъ, что слова "и отъ Сына" были внесены въ оный извѣрнымъ образомъ. Мы считаемъ, потому, въ данномъ случаѣ достаточнымъ утверж-

we attach to those words the above meaning, that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are co-eternal, and that the Holy Spirit issuing from the Father through the Son is from eternity the Spirit of both the Father and the Son.

3. *Concerning tradition.* The Church of England accepts and venerates the primitive traditions of the Church which are in harmony with Holy Scripture, remembering that the canon of Scripture itself is received from tradition. In this way it accepts the term "Trinity," which describes the relation of the three holy persons of the Godhead, the observance of the Lord's Day, and the baptism of infants and other similar beliefs and practices of the universal Church. The Church of England has always proclaimed itself studious of antiquity and averse to novelties. But it holds many matters of discipline and ritual indifferent and within the power of national or particular Churches to change and order according to the needs of the times.

#### CONCLUSION.

We desire in all brotherly love that those who read the foregoing answers will read them in a spirit of Christian kindness and hopefulness. "Blessed are the peacemakers"; and especially

дать, что придаемъ этимъ словамъ вышензложенный смыслъ, что Отець, Сынь и Св. Духъ совѣчны и что Св. Духъ, исходя отъ Отца чрезъ Сына, есть отъ вѣчности Духъ и Отца и Сына.

3. *Касательно преданія.* Англиканская Церковь принимаетъ и читаетъ первоначальныя преданія Церкви, которыя согласны съ Св. Писаніемъ, памятуя, что самый канонъ Св. Писанія полученъ по преданію. Такимъ образомъ она принимаетъ слово “Троица,” которое выражаетъ отношеніе трехъ Святыхъ Лиць Божества, празднованіе Воскреснаго дня, крещеніе младенцевъ и другія подобныя вѣрованія и практику вселенской Церкви. Англиканская Церковь всегда провозглашала свою заботливость объ изученіи древности и отвращеніе отъ повозведеній. Но она же считаетъ многія вещи, касающіяся дисциплны и обрядности, безразличнымъ, — такими, которыя всякая національная или помѣстная Церковь имѣетъ полное право измѣнять и устанавливать согласно съ потребностями времени.

#### ЗАКЛЮЧЕНІЕ.

Изъ глубины братской любви мы желаемъ, чтобы тѣ, кто станутъ читать предыдущіе отвѣты, прочли ихъ въ духъ христіанской снисходительности и надежды. “Блаженны миротворцы,” по въ особенности блаженны

blessed are those who make peace within the fold of Christ. We cannot believe that it is His will that His children should be separated from one another because they do not think alike on all difficult points. Divisions and strifes among Christians are the work of the enemy of mankind. Coldness among Christians tends to weakening the witness which the Church ought to give to Christ. Let all Christians therefore who read these pages determine that they will make a serious effort to promote a clearer mutual understanding, and closer and more friendly relations between members of the Eastern and Anglican Churches, with a single eye to God's glory and the benefit of immortal souls.

тѣ, которые творять миръ въ стадѣ Христовомъ. Мы не въ состояніи допустить, чтобы такова была Его воля, чтобы чада Его оставались раздѣленными другъ отъ друга въ силу того, что они неодинаково мыслятъ относительно всѣхъ трудныхъ пунктовъ. Раздѣленія и ссоры между христіанами—дѣло врага человѣческаго. Взаимная холодность между христіанами ведетъ къ ослабленію того свидѣтельства, которое Церковь должна дать о Христѣ. А потому пусть всѣ тѣ христіане, которые прочтуть эти страницы, примуть твердое рѣшеніе, что они серьезно постараются содѣйствовать болѣе ясному взаимному пониманію и болѣе близкимъ и дружественнымъ сношеніямъ между членами Восточной и Англиканской Церквей съ единственною цѣлію прославить Бога и облагодѣтельствовать безсмертныя души.

OXFORD: HORACE HART  
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY







Copy of a letter sent by the Secretary of the Theological College Department of the B. C. C. U. to the Right Hon. and Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of London, Nov. 30th, 1898.

- - - - -

My Lord Bishop:

In view of the importance of the work in which the Student Christian Movement is engaged, and more particularly that branch of it which affects Theological colleges, it would be a source of strength to us to know that we have your Lordship's sympathy and approval of the principles upon which the Student Movement in this and other lands undoubtedly rests. The Basis on which we affiliate any College Christian association (and in the case of a Theological college, an association that is co-extensive with the college) is as follows: "a Belief in Jesus Christ as God the Son and only Saviour of the World." The main specific objects for which we thus unite men in different Theological colleges are:-

1. Intercession for each other and students in all lands.
2. The study of Missions while at college, with a view to the adoption of the Watchword "The Evangelisation of the World in this Generation" as an ideal and an aim.
3. The promotion of the spirit of true unity by the deepening of the spiritual life.

Such is our Basis and such our objects. In your Lordship's opinion, does this Basis constitute a definite enough bond between those associations which come together for the above specific objects?

Do you think it embodies the central ideas of Christianity adequately enough for us to conscientiously ask those to federate upon it whom we know to hold much fuller conceptions of what should be accepted as Catholic Faith and practice?

Do you feel that such could conscientiously associate themselves with colleges of any denomination without compromising the highest views of Churchmanship?

The desire of this world-wide movement is to create among Christian students of all shades of thought (subject to assent to the Basis) an atmosphere of mutual knowledge, and one where the influence of nationality upon Christian ideals can be wholly studied: - May we venture to ask you to express your opinion as to whether our work makes for consolidation rather than for disintegration; and whether we seem to be promoting an expression of existing unity in the church

Church of Christ which when realized must promote that Unity of the Church, whatever it be, that exists in the mind and will of God.

I am,

Your Lordship's obedient servant,  
(Signed) W. H. T. Gairdner.

Copy of reply to above letter.

Fulham Palace, S. W.  
Dec. 2, 1898.

My Dear Mr. Gairdner,

The practical point on which you ask my opinion is this: Do I think that members of Theological Colleges in connexion with the Church of England would in any way compromise their position as thorough and loyal members of that Communion by joining the British College Christian Union, which aims at uniting students of all denominations for the purpose of promoting missionary zeal? I do not think so. I regard the Basis of "a belief in Jesus Christ as God the Son and only Saviour of the world" as one which is independent of the question of ecclesiastical organization. When practical work is to be done we must recognize that it must be done by each of us according to the principles of ecclesiastical organization to which we belong. But the object of your Union is to prepare the way for practical work by prayer, by study, by spiritual endeavor. These are objects and methods which are common to all Christians. They can be pursued in different ways. But all may unite in resolving to pursue them. Such union for the general purpose of promoting missionary work does not involve any surrender of individual convictions about the best form in which the Christian Truth can be expressed. It is in the Mission field especially that forms of organization are subjected to the most searching test. No one religious body can undertake all the work that is to be done. Combination among students might help to remove misunderstandings, which are too often engendered by the ignorance which comes from exclusiveness.

Your endeavor has my warm sympathy.

I am,

Yours truly,

(Signed) M. LONDON.

W. H. T. Gairdner, Esq.

# The Church

The Faith once delivered unto the

SATURDAY, JULY 2, 1910.

## Archbishop Davidson's Address at Edinburgh.

The Archbishop of Canterbury at the World's Missionary Conference had the place of honor. He was the first in the list of speakers and he treated his subject with the dignity and impressiveness which mark his utterances on the public platform. Dr. Davidson obviously spoke in a representative capacity, mindful of the fact that the Church of England, by his presence at the Conference, was being brought out of its position of aloofness into sympathetic relations with the general missionary movement of a considerable portion of the Christian world. This aspect of the situation doubtless influenced the Archbishop's choice of certain topics and accounts for his careful avoidance of contentions, to deal with which in any way might have brought upon him the criticism of one or another section of the English Church. This reserve was to a certain extent unfortunate, and we think that the Archbishop could have made a masterful stroke toward the conciliation of English-speaking Christians if he had kept his eyes less resolutely fixed on that part of the Anglican Communion of which he is the head. It will be seen that he avoided any specific reference to the missionary achievements of Evangelical Christianity. A generous recognition of their leadership in this field would have been an appropriate note to strike in inaugurating the sessions of the Conference. By neglecting to strike it, the Archbishop followed just those precedents in Anglicanism which are so apt to obscure that work of conciliation which Anglicans claim as their peculiar prerogative and yet fail to exercise because they are timorous. Thus they impress those whom they wish most to influence as the exponents solely of self-interest. It was hardly tactful before such an assembly as had gathered in the Conference to give such a prominent position to the meetings of the Bishops at Lambeth. These have certainly, to put it mildly, done little effective work, either in promoting the missionary expansion of Christianity or in making it possible for missionaries actually at work in the field to co-operate for the expansion of the Kingdom of Christ.

It is a pleasing contrast to turn from the atmosphere of ecclesiastical diplomacy in the Archbishop's speech to those portions of it where he spoke as a Christian man and as a pastor of his people. His interpretation of the spontaneous response evoked by missionary heroism is rendered with a truth and beauty that

will strike every reader. "Many a time," he said, "after quiet talks with some simple-hearted worker who is spending himself ungrudgingly in the Master's service—be it under an African sun or in the Arctic circle, or in the islands of the stormy sea—I have found myself literally tingling with a mingled sense of humiliation and of eager enthusiasm as I have set the value and the glory of his persistent self-sacrificing devotion to our Lord against the value of our own poor, commonplace work at home, and I have fallen on my knees and asked that He who seeth in secret will show us how to co-operate in some more fruitful way, and to link the two tasks, that man's and mine, more wisely and more effectively than we seem to link them now."

This frank protest against the mechanism of Church administration, coming from one of the most eminent and highly placed ecclesiastics in the Christian world, should make Church organizations see that the possibilities of missionary energy are within the reach of the highest as well as the obscurest of Christian ministers. The movement initiated by the Edinburgh Conference may be revolutionary, and it ought to be revolutionary in the sense that it should prepare the minds of men for cutting themselves off from the evil traditions of a past which made of missionary work only a minor incident in the government and policy of the Church. Despite the heroic endeavors of the present age in the expansion of Christianity, its wonderful examples not only of self-sacrifice but of self-sacrifice coupled with intelligence, the Archbishop's words condemning the apathy and lukewarmness of the Church at home to the needs of the non-Christian world are not exaggerated. The antidote is plain and simple. "The place of missions in the life of the Church must," as the Archbishop says at the close of his address, "be the central place and none other. That is what matters. Let people get hold of that, and it will tell—it is the merest commonplace to say it—it will tell for us at home as it will tell for those in the field. Secure for that thought its true place, in our plans, our policy, our prayers, and then the issue is His, not ours."

## FIRST EDITORIAL

Does the Protestant Episcopal Church Desire  
Complete Isolation?

It is an interesting coincidence that just as we were calling the attention in conversation of some of our friends in the Episcopal Church to the fact that if their communion persisted in remaining outside of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America it might suddenly find itself in complete isolation, Dean Henson, of Durham Cathedral, preaching in St. Mark's in Oxford, on February 1, had already warned the Anglican Church of this very possibility if it persisted in ignoring the Free Churches, while at the same time it was itself being ignored by the Roman Catholic communion.

Dean Henson's sermon has made a great stir throughout England. It was a bold and frank attack upon the High Church attitude toward communion with the Nonconformist churches, and was called forth by the Kikuyu incident. One of his hearers, writing to the "Westminster," says that his address was "the most sincere, the most splendidly intellectual pronouncement to which he has ever been privileged to listen. During thirty-six years of unusually wide opportunities of attending Anglican churches, as a layman who has taught, edited and written High Church instructions, I must confess that I have never before heard so learned, so closely reasoned, so sagacious and so sustained an attack upon the High Church attitude toward communion with non-episcopal churches. His occasion was, I make no doubt, great in the history of the Church in the twentieth century."

According to the London "Times" Dean Henson said: "Within the missionary field the Church of England is being steadily driven into complete religious isolation, and the driving force is the same—the inexorable logic of a certain view of Christianity, the view which specifically and essentially is that of the Roman Catholic Church. The solemn significance of this episode in East Africa lies in the fact that it discloses the true nature of the issue upon which the Church of England must come, and that speedily, to a determination. The appeal lies, not to the bishops, who perhaps on such a question are not well fitted to decide (for all men magnify their office, even bishops), but to the facts of history, to the lessons of experience, above all to the reason and conscience of devout and considering English Churchmen. Do they sanction the policy of religious isolation? Is the form of polity in their deliberate judgment a matter of primary or of secondary importance? The answer to that question must needs determine our whole treatment of non-Episcopal churches.

"If time were at my disposal I would ask you to consider the situation in Canada, where the Church of England is losing perhaps the most considerable spiritual opportunity which has ever come within its reach. I would beg you to mark the same fatal cause operating in Australia, where a hopeful project of union between Anglicans and Presbyterians has been wrecked by it. The Anglican Church is self-condemned to spiritual solitude, disowned by Rome and the East, disowning all Protestant churches."

These are strong words. But they have a great amount of truth in them, and, furthermore, they apply to the situation in America as decidedly as to that in England. It is a situation that has given us much concern. We admire the Episcopal Church for the splendid services it is rendering the nation. It is at the very front of the movement for social service. It carries upon its heart the burden of the poor. It has enriched the worship of all our churches. It has stood for the divine origin and spiritual authority of the Church in an age when many even of those composing it would classify it with philanthropic societies and lodges. It has kept the ideal of organic unity of the churches constantly before the world. It contains a great host of consecrated men. In it are many of our warmest co-laborers and friends. It is just because of these things that we raise this question. We do not want to see it left, a small, weak, isolated body, between all the united Protestant churches on the one side, and the vast, powerful Roman Catholic Church on the other. Yet we wonder if that may not happen if it persists in remaining outside the Federal Council of Churches.

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America now comprises all the great denominations in its federation, with the exception of one—which will probably soon come in—and presents the spectacle of nearly 20,000,000 Christians leagued together in a co-operation in service, a unity of action, if not an organic unity. Moreover, that unity is every day becoming more and more marked. The spirit of unity and the actual bond of fellowship has grown more in the last two years within the Council than in all its previous history. All the denominations are more and more turning to it to voice their common Gospel and do their common tasks. The leaders of all the denominations are among its officers and are serving on its commissions. Moreover, the people are turning to it, as are various organizations, to do its tasks. When a great organization for international good-will wished, the other day, to send a distinguished college professor from Japan upon a three months' tour of our cities to plead for justice in our consideration of the Japanese problem it asked the Federal Council to act as its agent. The great undenominational religious organizations of men and women are more and more turning to it as a common meeting ground. It is rapidly becoming a compact, unified, real organization of the Protestant churches of America for common service. It has just opened offices at Washington to express the sentiments of Protestantism on legislation affecting the moral conditions of the nation. And the Protestant Episcopal Church remains outside of it, alone among all the large denominations.

On the other side is the great Roman Catholic Church, compact, solid, superbly organized, with a unity in itself that is the perpetual wonder of the ages. It numbers 13,000,000 souls, a community almost as large as that represented by the Federal Council. It ignores all Protestant bodies. It ignores the Episcopal Church just exactly as thoroughly as it does the Baptists or Presbyterians. It presents the same attitude toward communion with the Episcopal Church as the Episcopal Church presents toward communion with the other Protestant bodies. It considers the Episcopal Church a sect just as absolutely as the High Church party in the Episcopal Church considers the Methodists a sect. So while the Episcopal Church remains of its own choice outside of united Protestantism, united Roman Catholicism refuses on its side to recognize it. Does it wish to put itself into this complete isolation permanently, and remain a little group in spiritual solitude, outside both of united Protestantism and united Roman Catholicism?

They tell us—and we would have all sympathy with this contention did we believe it had any power to achieve union in it—that they remain out of federated Protestantism so that they can act as a mediating party in working for the reunion of Christendom. They believe that they can approach both the great Western and Eastern branches of the Catholic communion with more chance of being heard than they could were they outwardly aligned with the federation of Protestant bodies. We see nothing in the attitude of the Roman communion to give the slightest foundation for this hope. The Roman Church's attitude toward the High Church party in Anglicanism is no slightest whit differs from its attitude toward the most ultra Protestant Wesleyan. The adoption of confession, worship of the saint, even the saying of Mass, draws one no nearer to the Roman Catholic communion, in the mind

of Rome, than does a Protestant prayer meeting, if the one  
step is to be taken. And Rome is insisting on that step  
as imperatively and irrevocably as ever, namely, submission  
to the Pope as the divinely ordained head of the Church. We  
have followed carefully recent addresses by Roman Catholics  
on church union. They all invariably end with this. Union  
is the simplest matter in the world to the Roman Church. It is  
nothing but the runaway children coming home. The mother  
is forgiving and holds out her arms. There is no other way  
for union but to acknowledge her and run to her arms. Episco-  
palsians are as welcome as any other self-exiled children. Read  
Cardinal Gibbons's recent address on this subject. Read Pro-  
fessor Remy's clear statement in THE CHRISTIAN WORK for  
January 24

We do not mean to say that there will never be any hope  
for reunion with Rome except on this one-sided basis.  
Modernism is making great strides in that Church. It may  
some day burst forth with a tidal energy that will make the  
Roman Catholic Church emphasize the word *Catholic* rather  
than the word *Rome*. But if the day should ever come that  
Rome showed willingness to even talk union with Protestants  
would she not turn to the great Protestant union already  
existent in spirit, liable, we think, to grow into an organic unity  
in half a century if the cementing process goes on as fast as  
it is now moving; the federated Protestantism of America  
rather than to a little isolated group, having no claim upon  
the Roman Church and having no share in that united  
Protestantism of America which is rapidly becoming more and  
more a fact? Already Roman Catholics have co-operated with  
the Federal Council in social service of the churches. We  
believe the splendid call that the Episcopal Church is making  
for a World Conference on Faith and Order would be heeded  
much more by both *Rome* and the Protestant communions was  
it at the present union of our American churches.

# REUNION

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE  
REPORT AND THE FREE  
CHURCHES

Price 4d.

S.P.C.K.



# REUNION

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE  
REPORT & THE FREE CHURCHES

LONDON  
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING  
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE  
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.2

1924



PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

## EXPLANATORY NOTE

THE Joint Conference of representatives of the Church of England and representatives of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England issued a report on Church Unity in May, 1922. The Federal Council received the report in the following September and cordially encouraged the Joint Conference to continue the conversations on the basis there laid down. It asked that further consideration should be given to certain practical difficulties, in particular "The status of the existing Free Church Ministry."

The Joint Conferences were resumed and the Anglican members agreed upon a memorandum on this subject. The memorandum was submitted to the whole of the Joint Conference, and was sent forward by it to the Federal Council with a note signed by the Free Church representatives. The Federal Council, in September, 1923, adopted a statement of its own position in a series of resolutions on the points raised by the memorandum. As that memorandum refers to the first report of the Conference, it has been thought right for the general convenience that that first report should be published together with the memorandum and the resolutions of the Federal Council in the following pages.

We submit the document as a whole for the consideration of Christian people in the belief that we are being guided step by step on the pathway of peace. The power of effective action must depend on the sympathy, the co-operation, and the prayers of those to whom is given the trust of membership in the Church of God.

RANDALL CANTUAR:

COSMO EBOR:

J. SCOTT LIDOETT, *Moderator of the Federal  
Council of the Evangelical Free Churches.*

November 20th, 1923.

## MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE, 1923.

- ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. \*REV. J. D. JONES, M.A., D.D. (Congregational).  
 \*ARCHBISHOP OF YORK. REV. S. M. BERRY, M.A. (Congregational).  
 BISHOP OF LONDON. \*REV. CHARLES BROWN, D.D. (Baptist).  
 BISHOP OF WINCHESTER. REV. W. T. DAVISON, M.A., D.D. (Wesleyan).  
 \*BISHOP OF SALISBURY. REV. J. C. CARLILE, C.B.E., D.D. (Baptist).  
 BISHOP OF ELY. SIR WALTER ESSEX (United Methodist).  
 BISHOP OF LICHFIELD. REV. W. Y. FULLERTON (Baptist).  
 †BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD. \*REV. A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D. (Congregational).  
 \*BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH. REV. R. C. GILLIE, M.A., D.C.L. (Presbyterian).  
 BISHOP OF HEREFORD. REV. S. HORTON (Primitive Methodist).  
 \*BISHOP OF RIPON. REV. H. MALDWIN HUGHES, B.A., D.D. (Wesleyan).  
 \*BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER. \*REV. J. SCOTT LIDGETT, M.A., D.D. (Wesleyan).  
 \*BISHOP GIBSON, D.D. MR. HERBERT MARNEAM (Baptist).  
 \*†REV. W. H. FRERE, D.D. BISHOP H. R. MUMFORD (Moravian).  
 REV. T. NIGHTINGALE (United Methodist).  
 \*PROFESSOR A. S. FEAKE, M.A., D.D. (Primitive Methodist).  
 REV. ALEXANDER RAMSAY, M.A., D.D. (Presbyterian).  
 RT. HON. WALTER RUNCIMAN (Wesleyan).  
 REV. W. B. SELBIE, M.A., D.D. (Congregational).  
 REV. J. ALFRED SHARP (Wesleyan).  
 \*REV. P. CARNEGIE SIMPSON, M.A., D.D. (Presbyterian).  
 REV. HENRY SMYTH (United Methodist).  
 RT. HON. J. H. WHITLEY, M.P. (Congregational).  
 REV. F. L. WISEMAN, B.A. (Wesleyan).  
 REV. THOMAS YATES (Congregational).  
 REV. WALTER H. ARMSTRONG (Wesleyan).  
 REV. W. L. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Presbyterian).  
 \*REV. J. H. SHAKESPEARE, M.A., D.D. (Baptist).

\* Members of the Joint Sub-committee, 1923.

† Died July 14, 1923, but had previously approved the Memorandum on p. 13.

‡ Consecrated Bishop of Truro, November 1, 1923.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXPLANATORY NOTE - - - - -	3
MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE, 1923 - - - - -	4
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT AND REPORT OF THE JOINT CONFERENCE, 1922 - - - - -	7
MEMORANDUM ON THE STATUS OF THE EXISTING FREE CHURCH MINISTRY, PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND REPRESENTATIVES ON THE JOINT CONFERENCE, JULY 6, 1923 -	13
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE EVAN- GELICAL FREE CHURCHES, SEPTEMBER 18, 1923 - - - - -	19



# I

## REPORT OF THE JOINT CONFERENCE AT LAMBETH PALACE, 1922

### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

THE time has, in our opinion, come when it is desirable that information should be made public as to the present outcome in this country of the "Appeal to All Christian People," which was issued nearly two years ago by the Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

The Appeal was transmitted by the Archbishop of Canterbury in August, 1920, to the different Christian Churches at home and abroad. On September 28th, 1920, a provisional statement in reply was issued by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England at their annual meeting, and was endorsed by the National Free Church Council. In April, 1921, a fuller statement from the same source was published under the title, "The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal," and in September, 1921, as the result of detailed examination and discussion, the following resolution was passed:

"The Federal Council, having noted the suggestion of the Bishops that a central conference should be held between representatives of Episcopal and non-Episcopal Communion upon the whole subject of the Appeal, and further desiring explication of expressions in the Appeal which are felt to have an ambiguous character, hereby appoints the following with a view to such Conference with the two Archbishops and with other members of the Church of England whom they may appoint: \*Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D. (Moderator); Rev. Charles Brown, D.D.; Rev. W. T. Davison, M.A., D.D.; Sir Walter Essex; Rev. W. Y. Fullerton; \*Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.; Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A.; Sir Alfred Pearce Gould, K.C.V.O., M.S.; Rev. A. J. Viner; Rev. S. Horton; Rev. H. Maldwyn Hughes, B.A., B.D.; \*Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D.; Right Rev. Bishop Mumford; Rev. T. Nightingale; \*Professor A. S. Peake, M.A., D.D.; Rev. Alex. Ramsay, D.D.; Right Hon. Walter Runciman; Rev. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.; Rev. J. Alfred Sharp; \*Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A., D.D.; Right Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P.; Rev. Henry Smith; Rev. W. Lewis Robertson, M.A., Rev. Walter H. Armstrong, and \*Rev. J. H. Shakspeare, M.A., D.D., secretaries."

With a view to the desired Conferences, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York nominated as representatives of the Church of England the Archbishop of Canterbury, \*the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Winchester, \*Gloucester, Ely, Lichfield, \*Peterborough, Chelmsford, Hereford, and \*Ripon. \*The Bishop of Salisbury was subsequently added, together with \*Dr. Headlam, Regius Professor of Divinity of Oxford, and \*Dr. Walter Frere.

On November 30th, 1921, the Conference met at Lambeth Palace under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and after prolonged discussion appointed a committee of thirteen persons (six Church of England and six Free Churchmen) to consider, under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of York, some of the issues involving large questions of principle which had been raised during the Conference. The names of those who formed the committee are marked with an asterisk in the foregoing lists. This committee held prolonged meetings in Lambeth Palace in January, March, and April, 1922, giving consideration chiefly to the three following subjects: (1) The nature of the Church; (2) The nature of the Ministry; (3) The place of Creeds in a United Church. The committee ultimately decided to present their report in the form of a series of propositions to which they had unanimously agreed. The Conference met at Lambeth Palace on May 24th, 1922, to receive the report. The report was considered, and after full discussion the Conference unanimously gave its general approval to the several propositions in the form printed below.

The report must be submitted to the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, at whose request the Conference was arranged. But the members of the Conference who represent that Council concurred with the representatives of the Church of England in deciding that, without prejudice to any decision of the Council, the report should at once be made public for the information of the Churches represented in the Conference and of all Christian people. It will be understood that the propositions which the report contains are not intended as a complete statement of the great subjects with which they deal; nor even as expressing what individual members of the Conference or the Churches which they represent might regard as a full statement of their own positions. They are submitted simply as expressing substantially the very large measure of agreement which, after full and frank discussion, the Conference had been enabled to reach.

It is obvious that many matters of great importance are not dealt with in this interim report. These must be the subject of future discussion. But the members of the Conference hope that

the agreement which they have so far reached may prove to be a basis upon which, by God's help, further agreement leading to practical action may be built. Meanwhile, we would earnestly press upon all who have this great matter at heart that they should remember steadily, both in public and private prayer, the possibilities which, as we believe, God is opening to our view, in firm assurance that He will, in His own good time, show us the manner of their accomplishment.

RANDALL CANTUAR:

COSMO EBOR:

J. D. JONES, *Moderator of the  
Federal Council.*

May 29th, 1922.

## THE REPORT AS ACCEPTED BY THE CONFERENCE

### I.—ON THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH.

1. The foundation of the Church rests not upon the will or consent or beliefs of men, whether as individuals or as societies, but upon the creative Will of God.

2. The Church is the Body of Christ, and its constitutive principle is Christ Himself, living in His members through His Spirit.

3. As there is but one Christ, and one Life in Him, so there is and can be but one Church.

4. This one Church consists of all those who have been, or are being, redeemed by and in Christ, whether in this world or in the world beyond our sight, but it has its expression in this world in a visible form. Yet the Church, as invisible and as visible, is, by virtue of its one life in Christ, one.

5. This visible Church was instituted by Christ as a fellowship of men united with Him, and in Him with one another, to be His witness and His instrument in the spread of His Kingdom on earth.

6. As a visible Church it must possess certain visible and recognizable marks whereby it can be seen and known by men. These have been since the days of the Apostles at least the following: (a) The profession of faith in God as revealed and incarnate in Christ; (b) the observance of the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself; (c) an ideal of the Christian life protected by a common discipline; (d) a ministry, representative of the Church, for the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, and the maintenance of the unity and continuity of the Church's witness and work. (See II, 1.)



7. Baptism is by the ordinance of Christ and of His Apostles the outward and visible sign of admission into membership of the Church.

8. The Church visible on earth ought to express and manifest to the world by its own visible unity the one Life in Christ of the one Body.

9. The true relation of the Church and local Churches is that which is described in the New Testament—namely, that the Churches are the local representatives of the One Church. The actual situation brought about in the course of history in which there are different and even rival denominational Churches independent of each other and existing together in the same locality, whatever justification arising out of historical circumstances may be claimed for these temporary separations, cannot be regarded as in accordance with the Purpose of Christ, and every endeavour ought to be made to restore the true position as set forth in the New Testament.

10. The marks which ought to characterize the Church visible on earth are possessed by these existing separate Churches and societies of Christian people in very varying degree of completeness or defect. Hence, even though they be parts of the visible Church, they cannot be considered as all alike giving equally adequate expression to the Lord's Mind and Purpose. Some, indeed, may be so defective that they cannot rightly be judged to be parts of that Church. But such judgments, though made in trust that they are in accordance with the Divine Mind, must be regarded as limited to the sphere of the visible Church as an ordered society here on earth. It would be presumption to claim that they have a like validity in the sphere of the whole Church as the One Body of the redeemed in Christ, for within that sphere judgment can only be given by the All-knowing Mind and Sovereign Mercy of God.

## II.—THE MINISTRY.

1. A ministry of the Word and Sacrament is a Divine ordinance for the Church, and has been since the days of the Apostles an integral part of its organized life.

2. It is a ministry within the Church exercising representatively, in the Name and by the authority of the Lord Who is the Head of the Church, the powers and functions which are inherent in the Church.

3. It is a ministry of the Church, and not merely of any part thereof.

4. No man can take this ministry upon himself. It must be conferred by the Church, acting through those who have authority given to them in the Church to confer it. There must be not only an inward call of the Spirit, but also an outward and visible call and commission by the Church.

5. It is in accordance with Apostolic practice and the ancient custom of the Church that this commission should be given through Ordination, with prayer and the laying-on of hands by those who have authority given to them to ordain.

6. We believe that in Ordination, together with this commission to minister, Divine Grace is given through the Holy Spirit in response to prayer and faith for the fulfilment of the charge so committed.

7. Within the many Christian Communion into which in the course of history Christendom has been divided, various forms of ministry have grown up according to the circumstances of these several Communion and their beliefs as to the Mind of Christ and the guidance of the New Testament. These various ministries of Word and Sacrament have been, in God's providence, manifestly and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit in His work of "enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints." But the differences which have arisen with regard to the authority and functions of these various forms of ministry have been and are the occasion of manifold doubts, questions, and misunderstandings. For the allaying of doubts and scruples in the future, and for the more perfect realization of the truth that the ministry is a ministry of the Church, and not merely of any part thereof, means should be provided for the United Church which we desire, whereby its ministry may be acknowledged by every part thereof as possessing the authority of the whole body.

8. In view of the fact that the Episcopate was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby this authority of the whole body is given, we agree that it ought to be accepted as such for the United Church of the future.

9. Similarly, in view of the place which the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the faithful had in the constitution of the early Church, and the preservation of these elements of presbyteral and congregational order in large sections of Christendom, we agree that they should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church.

10. The acceptance of Episcopal Ordination for the future would not imply the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character, or the disowning of past ministries of Word

## 12 REUNION : LAMBETH CONFERENCE REPORT

and Sacrament otherwise received, which have, together with those received by Episcopal Ordination, been used and blessed by the Spirit of God.

### III.—THE PLACE OF THE CREED IN A UNITED CHURCH.

1. In a united Church there must be unity of Faith, which implies both the subjective element of personal adhesion and an objective standard of truth.

2. The supreme standard of truth is the revelation of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as summed up in Jesus Christ.

3. As the Church in its corporate capacity confesses Christ before men, there should be in the United Church a formal statement of its corporate faith in Christ as an expression of what is intellectually implied by its confession of Him.

4. The Creed commonly called Nicene should be accepted by the United Church as the sufficient statement of this corporate faith. The manner and occasions in which the Creed is to be used should be determined by the United Church.

5. With regard to a confession of faith at Baptism, the United Church would be justified in using the Creed which has been for centuries the Baptismal Creed of the Western Church, commonly called the Apostles' Creed. Its use at Baptism would imply recognition of the corporate faith of the Church therein expressed as the guide and inspiration of the Christian life.

6. The use of the Creeds liturgically in the public worship of the Church should be regarded as an expression of corporate faith and allegiance; and the United Church should be prepared to recognize diversities of use in this as in other liturgical customs.

7. When assent to the Creeds is required by the United Church, such assent should not be understood to imply the acceptance of them as a complete expression of the Christian Faith, or as excluding reasonable liberty of interpretation. It should be understood to imply the acceptance of them as agreeable to the Word of God contained in the Holy Scriptures, as affirming essential elements in the Christian Faith, and as preserving that Faith in the form in which it has been handed down through many centuries in the history of the Christian Church.

8. While we thus recognize the rightful place of the Creeds in the United Church, we also recognize most fully and thankfully the continued Presence and Teaching of the Living Spirit in His Body, and emphasize the duty of the Church to keep its mind free and ready to receive from Him in each day and generation ever-renewed guidance in the apprehension and expression of the truth.

## II

MEMORANDUM ON THE STATUS OF THE EXISTING  
FREE CHURCH MINISTRY

PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND REPRESENTATIVES\* ON THE JOINT CONFERENCE, AT LAMBETH PALACE, JULY 6, 1923.

THE Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England at its meeting in September, 1922, received the report of the Joint Conference held at Lambeth Palace, and reappointed its committee and sub-committee to continue the conferences. In so doing, in Paragraph III. of its report, the Council mentioned certain "practical difficulties which yet remain to be considered." Among them was "the status of the existing Free Church ministry." Accordingly the sub-committee proceeded to give long and full consideration to this subject, and we who represent the Church of England have been asked to submit a Memorandum upon it.

It will be remembered that the main object of the conferences which have been held has been to elucidate the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference to all Christian people. Whatever wishes or opinions we who submit this memorandum may individually have, we consider ourselves bound by that Appeal and not entitled to go beyond its statements, or what in our judgment may be legitimately inferred from them. Further, our memorandum cannot be regarded as an official interpretation of the Appeal. The responsibility for what is contained in it is limited to those who present it.

We are compelled to say at the outset that our difficulty in discussing the status of the Free Church ministry has been to discover accurately what the term includes and implies, whether the phrase represents any accepted unity as to the principles which underlie this ministry, or as to the manner in which it is conferred. We do indeed most thankfully acknowledge that the Free Church members of our Committee agreed with us in the statement of principles with regard to the ministry of Christ's Church, which were set forth in our first report (II. 1-6). But the very full, frank and friendly conferences which we have had together made it plain that in fact within the Free Churches there have been and are very varying traditions and conceptions as to the nature of the ministry, and as to the meaning of ordination,

\* For names of these representatives see page 4.

and very varying customs as to the manner in which ordination is conferred and ministers are accredited. For example, to mention only one of these differences, although in our first report it was agreed (II. 5) "it is in accordance with Apostolic practice and the ancient custom of the Church, that the commission by the Church should be given through ordination with prayer and laying on of hands by those who have authority given to them to ordain," yet in fact several of the Free Churches have not used in the past and do not always now use the laying-on of hands.

During our conferences we have been asked to consider Free Church ministries prospectively—from the point of view of the conceptions and usages in which they are increasingly ready to unite—rather than retrospectively—from the point of view of conceptions and usages which have been prevalent in the past. It is indeed a great satisfaction to think that the principles which we were able to set forth in our first report as agreed upon by us all are becoming more and more fully characteristic of the ministries of the Free Churches represented on our Committee. But our difficulty is that we are specifically asked to write about the Free Church ministry as it exists. We trust that our Free Church brethren in the Committee will generously appreciate the difficulty thus frankly expressed, and understand why it is not possible for us to give any single and unconditional answer to the question put before us.

In what follows in this memorandum it will be understood that we have in mind ministries, which in some real measure are given and exercised in accordance with the principles set forth in our first report—ministries which rest upon a long established order, which have been conferred by some solemn and authoritative act implying ordination to the ministry of the Universal Church and not merely commission to the ministry of a particular denomination, and which are regarded as involving a life-long vocation.

I. Such Free Church ministries we find it impossible to regard as "invalid," that is, as null and void, or as effecting none of the purposes for which the ministry has been Divinely ordained in the Church of Christ. Indeed, we wish that the terms "valid" and "invalid" could be discontinued, involving as they seem to do a knowledge of the Divine Will and purpose and grace which we do not possess, and which it would be presumption to claim.

But we consider that we are entitled by manifest tokens of Divine blessing which these ministries possess, and also by the spirit and the terms of the Lambeth Appeal about them to go further, and to say that we regard them as being within their several spheres real ministries in the Universal Church.

The bishops in the Lambeth Appeal began by saying: "We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the Universal Church of Christ, which is His Body." And as to the ministries of those communions which do not possess the episcopate, they say that they do not call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of these ministries, but on the contrary they thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace.

It seems to us to be in accordance with the Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.

II. Yet ministries, even when so regarded, may be in varying degrees irregular or defective.

The Committee has already agreed in regard to the now separate Churches that "even though they be parts of the visible Church they cannot be considered as all alike giving equally adequate expression to the Lord's mind and purpose." Such irregularities or defects may belong to the sphere of faith or discipline, and also to the sphere of ministry. There are some who consider our own ministry in one way or another defective or irregular. It is possible that even among the Free Churches themselves there may be ministries exercised by one which are regarded by another as in some respects, more or less important, irregular or inadequate. In each case such judgments must be regarded as due to our several beliefs as to the mind and purpose of our Lord Himself for His Church, and the continuous guidance of the Holy Spirit within the Church. The existence of these differences with regard to the authority and functions of the ministry, inevitable in the present divided condition of the Church, only increases our longing for a time when in a united Church they may be removed.

The belief and practice of the Anglican Church are set forth in the Preface to the Ordinal contained in the Book of Common Prayer, in which it is said "that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church; bishops, priests and deacons"; and that "to the intent that these orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of England, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon in the Church of England, or

suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination."

Thus the Anglican Church is bound to secure this authorization of its ministers for its own congregations, and no one could be authorized to exercise his ministry among them who had not been episcopally ordained.

It is not possible in this memorandum to set forth fully the reasons for this position. But it can be said:—

1. We regard the rule quoted above as much more than a mere rule of internal discipline. It embodies principles to which the Anglican Church has throughout its history adhered, and which contribute to the special position which it claims to hold in the Christian Church.

2. We cannot lose sight of the relations in which we stand to other episcopal Churches in East and West; nor can we ignore the danger of creating pain and disturbance, or even the possibility of schism, within our own communion if the rule and principle contained in the ordinal were to be set aside.

III. In the last section we have stated our position with the frankness which has been characteristic of our conferences. But we hope that what we have there said will be viewed, as regards the present, in conjunction with what we have said in the preceding section as to the character of some at least of the Free Church ministries as real ministries of the Word and Sacrament; and, as regards the future, in conjunction with what was said in the first report of the Committee (II. 8, 9). We have there recognized that these ministries have a value of their own as standing for elements of Presbyterian and Congregational order which should be maintained with the episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the united Church. We desire that in the episcopal ordinations of the future these elements should in some real way be represented so that both our traditions and those of the Free Churches should contribute to the fullness of the future ministry of a united Church.

Moreover, we see in the movements towards union, of which our conferences have been a happy and hopeful sign, that a new situation is being created which calls for new ways in which the ministry of the Free Churches and our own may be brought into closer relations. For when circumstances arise which have no exact precedent a true principle of "economy" entitles the Church to meet them with new methods. We may quote the words of the Committee on Reunion which submitted the Appeal and its

accompanying resolutions to the Lambeth Conference (Report, page 141):—"When men set their faces steadily towards the idea of our Appeal and specially when negotiations for organic reunion are in progress, or again when a scheme of union has in any place been adopted, situations will arise in which we should all agree that new lines of action may be followed." Thus (1) As regards the immediate present, here in England, the Convocations of Canterbury and York have endorsed the resolution of the Lambeth Conference (12 A. i.): "A bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers not episcopally ordained, who, in his judgment, are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal to preach in churches within his diocese, and to clergy of the diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers." We earnestly hope that this resolution will be followed by action in accordance with it. (2) As regards the future, if by God's blessing any of the Free Churches and the Anglican Church were to agree to unite on the basis of the acceptance of episcopacy for the future, the Lambeth Conference (Resolution 12, A. iii.), has given its approval to the suggestion that ministers of both the uniting communions should at once be recognized as of equal status in the councils of the united Church and that the terms of union should include for the time being the right of non-episcopally ordained ministers to conduct services other than celebrations of the Holy Communion, and to preach in Churches which possess an episcopal ministry, if licensed thereto by the bishop. But the whole subject of the arrangements which should be made for the exercise of ministry by the ministers of one of the uniting Churches in the congregations of the other during the period between the time when the union has been inaugurated and the time when it would be completed by the ministries of all the Churches having one common source and authority, is one which demands further and very careful consideration. We do not think it necessary to discuss this subject in the present memorandum. If our conferences are continued and the subject were to be expressly referred to us, we would be prepared to consider it. It is plain that during this period of transition there would be many inevitable irregularities and difficulties and a constant need of patience, charity, and mutual considerateness. But there would also be the sustaining and encouraging knowledge that each year would bring the time nearer when union would be sealed by the possession of one ministry throughout the united Church.

IV. Finally, we would urge that it is in the light of this hope for the future rather than from the point of view of the difficulties of the present or of the provisions necessary for a time admit-



tedly transitional that the problem of Reunion must be considered. It is towards the fulfilment of this hope that we must direct our thought, our labours, and our prayers.

#### APPENDED NOTE

PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE FREE CHURCH REPRESENTATIVES\*  
ON THE JOINT CONFERENCE.

The representatives of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England on the sub-committee, having considered the document presented by the Anglican members as their reply to the question of the status of the existing Free Church ministries, desire to express their cordial appreciation of the spirit in which the reply is conceived. While recognizing that the responsibility for this answer must rest with the Anglican members, the representatives of the Federal Council desire to record their opinion that the document contains statements of such importance as amply to justify their hope that the Federal Council will re-appoint the Committee to unite with the representatives of the Church of England in further discussion of the many points that still remain to be considered.

\* For names of these representatives see page 4.

## III

## FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND. RESOLUTION ON THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL

(ADOPTED BY THE FEDERAL COUNCIL ON TUESDAY,  
SEPTEMBER 18, 1923).

I. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England receives the report of its Committee, which contains the memorandum on "The Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry" by the Anglican members of the Joint Conference meeting at Lambeth. The Council concurs with its representatives on the Joint Conference in expressing cordial appreciation of the spirit in which this memorandum is conceived, and it has given to it respectful and careful consideration. Believing that a direct communication of this character from the Anglican representatives calls for, and is entitled to, some definite statement as to the attitude of the Free Churches in respect to it, the Council makes the following comments on its main positions:—

1. We cordially welcome the crucial declaration that "the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum—ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned—are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacrament in the Universal Church." The Lambeth Appeal itself spoke in general terms of these ministries as having "spiritual reality" and as having been "blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace." It is now explicitly said of them (a) that they minister the Gospel of Christ; (b) that they minister also the Sacraments; and (c) that they are within the Universal or Catholic Church. If the recognition thus so unmistakably given in words, were translated into unmistakable actions, a great and difficult problem in reunion would be within sight of practical solution.

2. We note, however, with regret that, in the succeeding section of the memorandum, not only is this recognition not followed by recommendations for appropriate action, but the plan contemplated and required for the exercise of a full ministry within the Anglican Church is precisely that plan which would be followed, and which is followed in the case of persons possessing no

kind of ministry—namely, episcopal ordination. This means that what has just been conceded in the most satisfactory language is not to be given effect to in practice. Any question, either on the part of the Anglican Church, or of that of the Free Churches—of “irregular” or of what may be regarded as “defective” denominational commission is quite a different matter, to be dealt with in its own proper way; but that way certainly is not ordination to the ministry of Word and Sacrament in the Church of Christ of a man already acknowledged to be in that ministry. All this seems to us manifest and even axiomatic; and we are unable to believe that the position which at one moment acknowledges that Free Church ministries are “real ministries of Christ’s Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church,” and at the next requires nevertheless that those in them must be ordained to the ministry of that very Word of Christ and those very Sacraments of Christ—that such a position will be found one on which our Anglican brethren, with consistency of thinking and acting, can permanently stand.

3. We turn to the grounds of this insistence on episcopal ordination, and we are referred to the Preface attached to the Ordinal in 1661, which laid it down that “no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions except he be called, tried, examined and admitted thereunto according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.” We remark that this drastic rule, which applies to “any of the said functions,” is not strictly obeyed by the Church of England to-day as regards the function of preaching; and the Lambeth Conference of 1920—as the present memorandum reminds us—expressly countenances this exception in certain circumstances. This is but one indication that we are dealing to-day not with the Anglicanism of the Restoration, which deliberately desired to exclude Nonconformists and which penalized them, but with the Anglicanism of the Lambeth Appeal, which earnestly seeks reunion and which approaches Nonconformity with friendship. But we should do injustice to our Anglican brethren who present this memorandum, if we suggested that they grounded themselves merely on a clause from a preface inserted at a time more marked by controversy than by charity. They say that this preface “embodies principles to which the Anglican Church has throughout its history adhered.” We submit that this is hardly accurate historically. It is well known that up to the time of this deliberately exclusive preface there were ministering in the cures of the Church of England “many”—it is Bishop Cosin’s reckoning—who had not

received episcopal ordination, and whom the Bishops did not re-ordain. We do not magnify these cases, which were, we admit, exceptional. But if the Church of England in the seventeenth century could receive ministers from certain reformed Churches without episcopal ordination, and yet did not thereby lose its catholic identity, then it could and can—so far as principle goes—in the twentieth century admit, by some method other than ordination, those whom, despite their not having had episcopal hands laid upon them, it has just formally and fully recognized as being really in the ministry of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church. It could do it so far as any "principles to which the Anglican Church has throughout its history adhered" are concerned. We ask no immediate or premature answer. We believe that God's guidance of us all in this matter has not ended, and that the last word on it has not been said on either side. We feel deeply that this age-long and difficult problem can be solved only by some great and worthy act, inspired by courage and vision, in which men and Churches are willing to take their lives in their hands for the sake of the realization of a great ideal.

II. The Federal Council makes the above comments on the memorandum which it has received in an entirely conciliatory spirit towards what it recognizes to be a friendly as well as a sincere statement. In the interests of union the representatives of the Free Churches have endeavoured to meet their Anglican brethren at every point, so far as they could do so without sacrifice of vital principle. The question of ordination is the place where we look to the Anglican Church to meet their Free Church brethren. The Council has felt that after three years of fruitful conference it could express its mind on this subject, as it has done, with perfect frankness. The movement towards reunion has now passed the stage when it can be dealt with simply by discussion; we have come close to the crucial issues, and must deal with them with clearness, courage, and charity.

III. The Council adds that the recognition of Free Church ministries given in the memorandum which it has considered enforces the contention which the Council has more than once emphasized that the deliberations over union in Conferences and Committees should be accompanied by practical action. Since Anglican clergy and Free Church ministers are in the one Universal Church, and are ministering the same Word and the same Sacraments, then, surely, there should be more of fellowship and co-operation than there is, even though the final difficulty about ordination be not yet surmounted. The Council feels the Union movement cannot—especially in the minds of the people—live entirely on private conferences and their reports; and it renewe

its declaration of last year that "the discussion of union should be increasingly accompanied by acts of unity between the Churches."

It heartily welcomes the references to this towards the close of the memorandum. And in this connection it notes with warm appreciation the visits of the two Archbishops and some of the Bishops to the Free Church Assemblies, and the presence of a number of Free Church preachers in Cathedral and other Anglican pulpits. The Council recognizes with deep gratitude the guidance and blessing of God in the course which the conferences have taken and the spirit by which they have been moulded. The way of reunion is not yet clear to any one of us. It is our part to seek a fuller understanding of one another in further conference and common prayer, believing that God's way will be revealed to us.

The Council reappoints the Committee as follows:—

Rev. Walter H. Armstrong.  
 Sir Ryland Adkins.  
 Rev. J. T. Barkhy.  
 Rev. S. M. Berry, M.A.  
 Rev. Charles Brown, D.D.  
 Rev. W. T. Davison, M.A., D.D.  
 Rev. J. C. Carlile, C.B.E., D.D.  
 Sir Walter Essex.  
 Rev. W. Y. Fullerton.  
 Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.  
 Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L.  
 Rev. S. Horton.  
 Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D.  
 Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D.  
 Sir Henry Lunn, M.D.  
 Mr. Herhert Marnham.  
 Bishop H. R. Mumford.  
 Rev. T. Nightingale.  
 Prof. A. S. Peake, M.A., D.D.  
 Rev. Alexander Ramsay, M.A., D.D.  
 Rev. W. L. Rohertson, M.A.  
 Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman.  
 Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., D.D.  
 Rev. W. B. Selhie, M.A., D.D.  
 Rev. J. Alfred Sharp.  
 Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A., D.D.  
 Rev. Henry Smith.  
 Rt. Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P.  
 Rev. F. L. Wiseman, B.A.  
 Rev. Thomas Yates.

It instructs these representatives to confer further on the matters above mentioned, and also on questions still outstanding of those remitted last year. And it again commends the whole issue to the blessing of God, and to the believing prayers and the practical interest of Christian people.









Downing Street imposed tariff, that will not only injure the white merchants but impoverish and unsettle the native communities, and, by setting up new wage standards, disorganize all local industries, it would be interesting to know, I can promise him something volcanic. And I will predict confidently that if any Government is ever fool enough to adopt the policy in the form proposed it will shatter the Empire to fragments.

3. There remains a third problem—the Dominions. Lord Beaverbrook thinks he has disposed of the difficulty by saying they "would be invited to join the Free Trade Empire either unconditionally or under such limitations as each might think it wise to impose for itself." In reality he has only glossed it over. What is to be the position of a Dominion like Australia, which maintains a protective tariff against the primary products of a neighbouring Crown Colony—e.g., the banana tax imposed in the interest of the Queensland banana-growers? Is that Dominion to receive the privilege of Free Trade in the markets of that Colony? Alternatively, where a Dominion pursues a protectionist policy against units of the Empire, are those units to retaliate?

Lord Beaverbrook ought not to take refuge behind vague formulae like "such limitations as each might think it wise to impose for itself." The country is entitled to have a plain answer to the following question. Given that as a preliminary step Great Britain and the Crown Colonies are organized into a Free Trade Empire, is a Dominion which discriminates protectively against all or any part of that Empire to be nevertheless considered as a member of that Free Trade Empire, and so entitled to the privileges which it withholds from its fellow-members; or is it to be held to have placed itself outside the Imperial Tariff wall and so to be debarred from free trade with its fellow units of the British Empire?

And conversely, where a foreign country desires to live on terms of complete Free Trade with Great Britain, is it to be admitted into the "Free Trade Empire," or is it to be compelled to change its policy and revert to tariffs by reason of being considered "a lesser breed without the law"?—I am, Sir, &c., R. B.

### THE COVENANT AND THE PACT

[To the Editor of the SPECTATOR.]

Sir,—Everyone must, I imagine, endorse your welcome given to various letters in the *Times* insisting that public opinion must express itself more clearly through the Press on the true purpose of the League. But in so far as the letters in question raised what seem to me, at least, to be groundless objections to the proposal so to amend the League Covenant as to bring it into harmony with the Kellogg Pact, I hope that you did not mean that the letters themselves necessarily represent the true purpose of the League accurately.

This is an important question, and cannot be dealt with in a few lines. It is possible that the *Spectator* will give me the opportunity of discussing it at rather greater length. Meanwhile I only ask to be allowed to suggest that my friend, Mr. Philip Kerr, in sounding an alarm regarding the proposed amendment of the Covenant, has not necessarily said the last word on the matter.—I am, Sir, &c., H. WILSON HARRIS.

*Reform Club, S.W.1.*

[We suggest that Mr. Philip Kerr and others who have sounded the alarm are only anxious that the full implications of any attempted synthesis of Pact and Covenant shall be appreciated. As we have said, the present Naval Conference shows what happens as long as statesmen cling to the hypothesis of war—and the notion of military "sanctions" induces or at least encourages that attitude of mind. We shall, of course, welcome a further exploration of the subject by Mr. Wilson Harris.—Ed. *Spectator*.]

### CHILDREN'S RENT ALLOWANCES

[To the Editor of the SPECTATOR.]

Sir,—Mr. W. L. Hare's letter in your issue of February 22nd launches a violent attack on children's rent allowances. Mr. Hare "takes his stand" on a series of propositions which completely exclude any new building with the exception of "re-housing on the site where necessary," and yet he must know that the worst feature of the housing problem to-day is the appalling overcrowding which exists throughout the country. I affirm without any hesitation that Mr. Hare's

proposals cannot possibly do anything to get the children out of the slums. The astonishing thing is that he utterly fails to perceive that the crux of the slum problem is the building of new houses to be let at rents which the slum-dweller can pay.

I believe that the best way of providing these houses is by means of a children's rent allowance, and I am much strengthened in this belief by the fact that the Committee of the National Housing and Town Planning Council, which was responsible for "A Policy for the Slums" and included thirty experienced persons representing all branches of housing, began their labours on the slum problem with a prejudice similar to Mr. Hare's against children's rent allowances. After intensive study of the matter for some months they unanimously signed the report recommending children's rent allowances.

So far as my experience goes, everybody I have met who has seriously studied the question as to what is the most economical way of getting the two million children out of the slums has come to the same conclusion—children's rent allowances. The only exceptions I know are your two correspondents, Mr. Hare and Mr. Townroe, and they offer no alternative constructive policy. If we listen to them there is no hope for the children in the slums.

Mr. Hare accuses me of ignoring the importance of town planning and of garden cities. I venture to say that I do nothing of the kind; nobody would be more pleased to see many garden cities in the making. But Mr. Hare knows as well as anybody what an uphill struggle Welwyn and Letchworth are having; to refuse to take any other action in the hope that the slum population of London may somehow be transferred to garden cities is to condemn that population to remain where they are indefinitely.—I am, Sir, &c.,

20 Mount Street, Manchester.

E. D. SIMON.

### THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND REUNION

[To the Editor of the SPECTATOR.]

Sir,—Mr. Pollard's letter in your issue of February 15th on "Reunion" is a curious mixture of unproved dogmatic assertion and serious historical blunder. He vigorously attacks the South India Reunion Scheme on the main ground that it would seriously jeopardize the catholicity of our Church, and he proceeds to make dogmatic statements concerning the "anti-Protestant" character of the Church of England, all of which prove that he is apparently unfamiliar with the origin and meaning of the word "Protestant" and also of its traditional use by Anglican Churchmen from the time of the Reformation. For from its origin at the Diet of Spires (1529) "Protestant" was not a negative but a positive "protest" or "witness for" the Catholic position of the Early Church—that the Word of God is the final appeal in all matters of doctrine.

It was this Catholic principle which our own English Reformers strenuously asserted so that Cranmer declared that "the Holy Scriptures must be to us the rules and judges of all Christian doctrine," and this principle was enunciated clearly in Article VI. It was this witness for, and return to, primitive Catholic Truth by our Reformers which justified Bishop Chr. Wordsworth in asserting that "the Church of England became Protestant at the Reformation that she might become more truly and purely Catholic." Therefore, to oppose the terms "Protestant" and "Catholic" is quite unhistorical and altogether foreign to the aims and convictions of all the "Reformed" whether Anglican or Continental. Dean Jaekson in 1627—"one of the greatest minds our Church has nurtured" (Dr. Pusey)—declared: "We Protestants of the Reformed churches . . . are the most conspicuous members of Christ's Holy Catholic Church." The Church of England is essentially Protestant just because she is truly and purely Catholic, and it is superfluous for her to state this fact in her formularies, although it does occur in the Coronation service and her American daughter uses it as her official title.

The construction which Mr. Pollard puts on the phraseology of our liturgy is certainly novel, but rather startling from the point of natural grammatical sense. Our prayer for "All Sorts and Conditions of Men" prays for "the good estate of the Catholic Church," and proceeds to ask that those who comprise it which it defines as "all who profess to call them-

selves Christians" may be "led into the way of truth," &c. There is no thought of any "contrast" between the Catholic Church and outsiders! Evidently Mr. Pollard has forgotten Canon 51 of 1603 which bids us pray for "the whole state of Christ's Holy Catholic Church—that is for all Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world," and goes on to single out as part of this Catholic Church—the *presbyterially* governed "Church of Scotland."

With regard to the South Indian scheme, Mr. Pollard ignores the fact that its basis secures Episcopacy as the permanent policy for the future United Church, and also actually incorporates the other three planks of the "Lambeth Quadrilateral." It has also evidently escaped his notice that a parallel "interim" arrangement to that proposed for the next thirty years in the Scheme was actually carried out in the case of the revived Scots Episcopal Church in 1661 at the precise time when the language of the Preface to our Ordinal, which Mr. Pollard quotes, was altered. Although this "Preface" laid down that *normally* only an episcopally ordained clergyman could minister in the Anglican Church, yet in the Scots branch, which Anglican bishops had just reconstituted, the existing Presbyterian ministers were allowed, *without reordination*, to minister the Sacraments even to their Episcopalian parishioners. The South Indian Scheme by contrast specially safeguards Anglican congregations, who may object to a non-episcopal minister celebrating the Lord's Supper for them.

But if this Scots expedient did not destroy the "Catholicity" of the Anglican Fellowship during the interim period succeeding 1602, it is difficult to see why the more carefully guarded South Indian Scheme should do so. Mr. Pollard is apparently unaware that these Proposals have received the special blessing and encouragement of Archbishop Germainos, the Orthodox Patriarch of Western Europe (see Article, "Review of the Churches," January, 1930).

It would be rather difficult for Mr. Pollard to prove his assertion that the orthodox "Protestant Churches," who, like those in the South India Scheme, accept the Catholic Creeds as set forth in "the Lambeth Quadrilateral," "reject much that is genuinely Catholic," since by the rule of the early Church Councils, the acceptance of the Nicene Creed alone was a sufficient test of Catholicity (*cf.* First Council of Ephesus 431). His is a novel assertion out of harmony even with the view of the early Tractarians who admitted that the "Churches of the Foreign Reformation" "constituted a portion of the Catholic Church."

Mr. Pollard asks if the Church of England is to throw in her lot with the "Protestant" bodies. It would be more correct to ask when she had ever formally dissociated herself from the other Reformed Churches. Bishop Hall, a strong upholder of "Episcopacy by divine right asserted," declared, "Blessed be God, there is no difference in any essential matter between the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation. We accord in every point of doctrine without the least variation"; while Bishop Cosin, a 1662 Reviser, affirmed that he always "in his soul, mind and affection united and held communion with those Protestant and well-reformed Churches which held the Catholic Faith and worshipped the Trinity." The South Indian Scheme is therefore directly in line with the historic attitude and sentiment of the Reformed English Church towards non-episcopal communions.—I am, Sir, &c., C. SYDNEY CARTER.

B.C.M. & T. College, Chifton.

[To the Editor of the SPECTATOR.]

SIR,—In a letter which appeared in your issue of February 15th from the Anglican Chaplain at Istanbul, he gives an interesting account of his relations with the Orthodox Church and its friendliness to our own Anglican Communion; but it might be a little unfortunate if they were left to find out from him our position and the teaching of our Prayer Book. He makes a good deal of play with the word "Protestant" and its absence from the book; whereas surely the spirit of the word is in it everywhere, the spirit of protest against Roman dogmas and practices, which, as he points out, the Eastern Church herself repudiates. Then, referring to the "Prayer for all Conditions of Men," he says;—"We first pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church," and then (the italics are mine) by way of contrast go on to pray that

others "who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit," &c.

I have often heard the words "who profess and call themselves Christians" read in a tone of pity or contempt or both; but I have never till now seen the prayer written out in full as Mr. Pollard suggests. Have I been wrong in thinking that the prayer gives us a definition of the Catholic Church "all who profess and call themselves Christians"—the emphasis being on the word "all"? It is surely going beyond the meaning of the words to say that "here the English Church clearly differentiates between herself as genuinely Catholic, and others who have no claim to that appellation."—I am, Sir, &c., R. G. P. BOWNRICE.

Lechlade, Glos.

## GERMAN EAST AFRICA AS BRITISH MANDATED TERRITORY

[To the Editor of the SPECTATOR.]

SIR,—On February 11th, Dr. Schnee, member of the Reichstag and ex-Governor of German East Africa, delivered a lecture to the Society of Foreign Affairs of the University of Berlin on German East Africa as British mandated territory.

He stated that a gradual improvement in economic affairs had taken place after the severe setback of the first mandate years, and that the expulsion of the Germans and the confiscation of their private property had played an important part in this setback. The present trade of (German) East Africa is about one and two third times as great as in the last few years before the War, whilst during the last ten years under German rule trade had increased fivefold. Since the repeal, in June, 1925, of the law forbidding the immigration of Germans a considerable number have returned and the white population is now roughly what it was before the War.

Dr. Schnee went on to say that the state of the country as regards the prevalence of epidemics compared extremely unfavourably with its state under German rule in particular. Sleeping sickness, which the Germans had combated with the greatest success, had become far more widespread under the mandatory administration. It was in the interest of the natives, who in many districts were in serious danger of being exterminated, that effective measures towards the combating of sleeping sickness and other epidemics should be taken, and that pressure should be brought to bear upon the Council of the League of Nations, whose duty it was to look after the administration of the mandate, to see that the services of experienced German doctors and bacteriologists should be enlisted in order to make up for the deficiency in British medical personnel.

The lecturer went on to discuss the British efforts to bring about a union between the mandated territory and the adjoining British colonies. He characterized the proposals of the Hilton Young Report, as well as those of the Wilson Report, as being in direct opposition to the mandate system. He said that the German Government had repeatedly declared in the Reichstag that it would most vigorously oppose any alteration in the mandate system.

One of the last actions of the late Dr. Stresmann had been to protest before the Assembly of the Council of the League of Nations in Geneva in September, 1929, against a union of East African mandated territory with the neighbouring British colonies. Mr. Henderson had replied that the British Government would communicate any plans of this kind to the Mandate Commission and would wait for an expression as to its attitude before definitely carrying out any such measures.

Dr. Schnee added that in face of the news at present being received from East Africa that the Governors concerned had reached an agreement on the question of unification of the fiscal system, the German Government must be made to take decisive steps to prevent measures which were so contradictory to the mandate system.

In conclusion, the lecturer stressed the point that Germany must, for economic and other reasons, take an active part in the mandate system, and that she should therefore acquire colonial mandates.—I am, Sir, &c.,

AN ENGLISHMAN IN BERLIN.

[We publish this letter so that our readers may learn what

\* \* \*

## Rev. Frank Ballard in an Anglican Pulpit.

In connection with the recent remarks by the Archbishop of York on "Christian Unity," it is interesting to notice that an example of this occurred last Sunday in his Grace's own diocese. The Rev. W. Odom, the broad-minded Evangelical vicar of the Heeley Parish Church, Sheffield, invited the well-known Wesleyan minister, Rev. Frank Ballard, to occupy his pulpit at the usual afternoon service for men. The occasion being so unique, the general public were admitted, and the church was crowded with a congregation that included a good many Non-conformists. Although an appeal was made to the Archbishop to frustrate Mr. Odom's fraternal aim, his Grace declined to interfere, intimating that he had the fullest confidence in the vicar's judgment. The vicar, at the beginning of the service, made a few remarks, in which he regretted the mischief and loss to spiritual religion through their lamentable divisions, and declared that for his part he preferred to follow the things which make for peace and unity. Mr. Ballard spoke from the pulpit, and said the occasion was interesting to him because it brought back memories of the old days when, as a youth, he spent many years as a chorister in a Church of England. The subject of the address—which lasted forty minutes—was, "How can we know the Bible is true?"

## Archbishop Temple's View of the Church.

Though he never hurried, and looked to the gradual effect of influences rather than to schemes, to bring about future unity, yet he believed in the idea of unity, and worked for it all his life. But he believed also most strongly in the idea of the Church. The Church was to him a great reality—an essential element in Christianity. He read it in the New Testament. He used to bring together the teaching of the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, and say, "As Christ is the fulness of the Godhead, so is the Church the fulness of Christ." Few men laid the lines of Churchmanship more broadly, but no one was more strong or definite in his teaching on the subject:

"Men speak as if Christians came first, and the Church after; as if the origin of the Church was in the will of individual Christians who composed it. But, on the contrary, throughout the teaching of the Apostles, we see that it is the Church that comes first, and the members of it afterwards. The Church takes its origin, not in the will of man, but in the will of the Lord Jesus Christ. He sent forth His Apostles; the Apostles received their commission from Him; they were not organs of the congregation; they were ministers of the Lord Himself. He sent them forth to gather all the thousands they could reach within His fold, but . . . the Church in all its dignity and glory was quite independent of the members that were brought within it. Everywhere men were called in; they do not come in, and make the Church by coming. They are called into that which already exists; they are recognized as members when they are within; not their membership depends upon their admission, and not upon their constituting themselves into a body in the sight of the Lord."—"E. G. S.", in the *London Guardian*.

At the late Anglican missionary conference the archbishop of Canterbury in his opening address said very truthfully: "The missionary societies embody the missionary conscience of the church. They are the only people in the church who have recognized their responsibility and the work is theirs and God's blessing is upon them." The archbishop thinks that it would be better if the church herself would do this great work instead of leaving it in the hands of societies. He hopes the time will come when the sense of duty to the heathen being universally felt it will be so done, but he added: "Meanwhile we must work through the societies with all our might. We must support the noble work which they are doing and which the church has not done."

---

# **World Council of Churches**

*(in Process of Formation)*

**Churches Which Have Accepted  
the Invitation**

## **AUSTRALIA**

Presbyterian Church of Australia  
Church of England in Australia

## **BELGIUM**

Eglise Chrétienne Missionnaire Belge

## **CANADA**

Church of England in Canada  
Presbyterian Church in Canada  
United Church of Canada

## **CHINA**

Church of Christ in China

## **CZECHOSLOVAKIA**

Evangelical Church of Bohemian Brethren  
(Ceskohratterska Cirkev Evangelicka)

## **ENGLAND**

Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland  
Churches of Christ in Great Britain and  
Ireland (Disciples)  
Congregational Union of England and  
Wales  
Presbyterian Church of England  
Methodist Church  
Church of England

## **ESTHONIA**

Evangelical Lutheran Church in Esthonia  
(Esti Evangeeliumi Luteriusu Kiriku)  
Orthodox Church in Esthonia

## FINLAND

Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland  
(Suomen Evankelis-Luterilainen Kirkko)

## FRANCE

Eglise Réformée de France  
Eglise Réformée d'Alsace et de Lorraine

## HOLLAND

Algemeene Doopsgezinde Societeit  
Evangelisch-Luthersche Kerk  
Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk  
Remonstrantsche Broederschap  
Old Catholic Church of Holland

## HUNGARY

Reformed Church of Hungary

## INDIA

Church of India, Burma and Ceylon  
South India United Church  
Federation of Evangelical Lutheran  
Churches in India  
Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar

## IRELAND

Methodist Church in Ireland

## LATVIA

Orthodox Church in Latvia

## LITHUANIA

Reformed Church of Lithuania (Lietuvos  
Ev.-Reformatu Baznycia)



## MEXICO

Methodist Church of Mexico

## NETHERLANDS EAST INDIES

Protestant Church of the Netherlands East Indies

## PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

United Evangelical Church of the Philippines

## POLAND

Evangelical Church of the Augshurgian Confession (Evangelisch-Augsburgische Kirche in Polen)

United Evangelical Church (Unierte Evangelische Kirche)

Polish National Catholic Church

## SCOTLAND

Congregational Union in Scotland

Episcopal Church in Scotland

Church of Scotland

## SOUTH AFRICA

Congregational Union of South Africa

## SWEDEN

Church of Sweden (Svenska Kirka)

## SWITZERLAND

Old Catholic Church of Switzerland

## U. S. A.

Northern Baptist Convention, U. S. A.

Seventh Day Baptist Churches

Congregational and Christian Churches

International Convention of Disciples of Christ

\*Protestant Episcopal Church  
Evangelical Church  
Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of  
Friends of Philadelphia and Vicinity  
Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of  
North America  
United Lutheran Church in America  
Methodist Church  
African Methodist Episcopal Church  
\*Moravian Church (Northern Province)  
Polish National Catholic Church of America  
Romanian Orthodox Episcopate in America  
Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church, Arch-  
diocese of New York and all North  
America  
Presbyterian Church in the United States  
of America  
Presbyterian Church in the United States  
United Presbyterian Church of North  
America  
Evangelical and Reformed Church  
Reformed Church in America

---

\* These two churches have expressed general approval  
but have not taken a final vote on membership.

## WEST INDIES

Anglican Church of the West Indies

## YUGOSLAVIA

Old Catholic Church of Yugoslavia

## THE SALVATION ARMY

June, 1940.

---

*Additional copies of this list  
may be secured from the*

**JOINT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

297 Fourth Avenue

New York

EXCERPT FROM THE HISTORY AND RECORDS OF THE WORLD MISSIONARY CONFERENCE, 1910  
QUOTING BISHOP BRENT

If we believe God to be our sufficiency, our lips will never dare to utter an unworthy or a weak argument on behalf of Christianity; our preaching will be stronger and purer and simpler; we shall not insult God, Who is our sufficiency, by attempting to prop Him up; we shall put only good stones into God's temple. We shall be saved from rash charges against those with whom we disagree; we shall be afraid to attempt conveyance by negation. We shall have courage to dare, because our God is daring,—and [what tremendous things you and I are called upon to dare!

Think of some of the ideals that are in the minds of men in our day and generation, the ideal, for instance, to bind all the nations of the world together, the East to the West, in spite of its strange and seemingly at times insuperable difficulties, in the face of the fact that national life has been in these past years acutely individualised. Think of the desire and the effort on the part of right-minded men and of right-minded nations to banish war; think of our purpose not merely to evangelise the world, but to Christianise the world, to make all men realise their sonship of God in Jesus Christ. Or, again, our ideal as it is in our minds to achieve a perfect unity, not merely the unity of those various portions of Christendom here represented, but the whole of Christendom. It is for us to shame Rome out of her proud loneliness; it is for us to startle the Greek Church out of her starved orthodoxy. That is the task before us. Let us be satisfied with nothing less, and we cannot be satisfied with anything less, because God is our sufficiency.]

Courage to dare will be the result of this conviction, and also courage to bear. Our God is a daring God, and He is also a bearing God.

p. 355 quoting Bishop Brent, in his charge of June 16, 1907:

"The same degree of devotion to Jesus Christ, of hunger and thirst after righteousness, of brotherliness, is found somewhere in each and all of the Churches alike, though in no one exclusively or pre-eminently. Naturally, we ally ourselves with that Church which presents the type most congenial to us. Whatever historic or theoretic necessities constitute the qualifications for Catholic recognition, no body that manifestly and progressively struggles to put on the mind of Christ, and whose adherents bear those clear tokens of God's Spirit that cannot be simulated--self-sacrifice to the death for Christ's sake, triumph over sin, world-wide love--can be read out of the Church of the living God. To say that Protestant Churches in that they have abandoned a certain historic order are not Catholic according to a fixed definition may be true, but it is idle folly to think or speak or act as though they were not of the Church of the living God Who, although He designed a visible unity, has proved to those who are not too blind to see, that He can and does use the broken order which man has chosen in its place. As well might the gardener who prophesies that a certain plant will not live if reared in unwonted conditions deny that it has true life when experience proves that its vitality is full and its beauty unimpaired. What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common."

p. 356

"The logic of the situation requires us to look with greater fairness on the things of our brethren, and to put off the spirit of aloofness which Christ exhibited only in the presence of deliberate wickedness and hardness of heart. The doctrine of separatism cannot but be hateful to God. Out of the very stones will He raise up children to Abraham, as history declares, if Abraham's lineal descendants lapse into Pharisaism, pointing to phylacteries inscribed with the pride of aristocratic descent as their sufficient credentials. Our first duty all around is to cease theological and ecclesiastical backbiting and to be loyal to one another in secret--not to try to win Christians from the allegiance that binds them by sneering at or decrying systems of teaching that we do not sympathise with mainly because we have never been at pains to understand them. It is a poor business tearing down other people's walls to build up our own. On the other hand, it is a great happiness to repair the breach in a neighbour's fabric; that is to say, to help the member of another Church to lay hold of his privileges with renewed earnestness and reality. I have had many a surprise of late since I have faced vexed questions, with the determination to do full justice to the point of view opposed to mine. There are not a few things that are looked upon as mutually exclusive which, according to my experience, best fulfil their vocation when they are made to be yoke-fellows.

"The cultivation of the Catholic as opposed to the sectarian spirit is our greatest work at present. I am not opposing frank, open controversy, feeble and unwilling controversialist though I am. Controversy conducted in good temper and in search of the truth is valuable. I am simply pleading for the putting on of the mind of Christ that we may look on the things of others interestedly and fairly. We can best prepare for it by identifying ourselves, when we pray, with those who are separated from us by chance rather than by choice. My hope is that the development of this temper will lead us by degrees to natural fellowship, culminating first in federal, and then, as 'state rights' gradually fade, into organic union."

p. 357

"But I do not believe that all is done when, after poring over our books, we come together and find an intellectual basis of agreement in Melbourne or Shanghai. Actual

sharing with one another of our good things as far as conscience permits will do more than anything else to advance God's truth and unite us according to His purpose. It is not merely that others are lacking in privileges possessed by us which we can lay at their disposal, but also that they have that which we have not and wherewith they can enrich us." (The Churchman, February 29, 1908.)